THE CLARENDON EDITION OF
THE WORKS OF DAVID HUME

AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING

EDITED BY TOM L. BEAUCHAMP

DAVID HUME

OXFORD

THE CLARENDON EDITION OF THE
WORKS OF DAVID HUME

An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding

The Clarendon Hume (*The Philosophical Works*) is a series of critical editions of David Hume's philosophical works and essays. It is intended for scholars concerned with Hume, the history of philosophy, and intellectual history generally. Each item in the series offers a critical text, a historical introduction, a statement of editorial policies and principles, historically oriented annotations, a critical apparatus, an extensive bibliography, and a comprehensive index.

An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding, first published in 1748 under the title *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding*, was the second of Hume's major philosophical works. In it he treats a broad range of issues in metaphysics and epistemology. The aim is to present a theory of the nature and limits of human understanding and to show the philosophical implications of this theory. Hume is revisiting and augmenting the theory of the understanding he first presented in Book 1 of *A Treatise of Human Nature*.

The last edition seen through the press by Hume appeared in 1772. It provides the copy-text for the present edition, but substantive changes to the text planned by Hume before his death are fully taken into account. The editor's introduction discusses the genesis, revision, publishing history, and reception of the work, which went into ten editions at the author's hand. Annotations provide information about Hume's sources, allusions, citations, and terminology. Biographical sketches of all of the individuals mentioned by Hume in the work are supplied in a separate appendix. Two bibliographies list the works cited by Hume and by the editor. Hume's original index to his text is reproduced, and a separate, comprehensive index is provided by the editor. The critical apparatus charts all substantive variations between editions and reports all editorial revisions.

This printing of the *Enquiry* is a corrected reissue of the critical edition originally published in 2000. A few errors in the editorial apparatus are corrected, and small alterations are made to the bibliographical schema. The text itself has not been altered, but text pages now include, in the margins, corresponding page numbers of the Selby-Bigge/Nidditch edition of this work.

THE CLARENDON EDITION OF THE
WORKS OF DAVID HUME

General Editors of the Philosophical Works

Tom L. Beauchamp David Fate Norton M. A. Stewart

DAVID HUME

An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding

A CRITICAL EDITION

EDITED BY

TOM L. BEAUCHAMP

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto
With offices in
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan South Korea Poland Portugal
Singapore Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Oxford University Press 2000
Introduction, notes and other editorial matter © Tom L. Beauchamp 2000

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

Reprinted 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
And you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

ISBN 978-0-19-926634-0

Printed in the United Kingdom by
Lightning Source UK Ltd., Milton Keynes

PREFACE

An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding was originally published in 1748 as *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding*. Hume altered the title in 1758 and revised the text for new editions until his death in 1776. This book is Hume's first published philosophical work after *A Treatise of Human Nature*. As such, it marks the transition from his early philosophy to his later philosophical writing.

This Oxford edition is the second volume issued in the critical editions designated the Clarendon Hume. Current techniques of textual scholarship, including collation and bibliographical analysis, are utilized in these volumes to establish authoritative texts. Works in the series record the substantive variants arising from Hume's revisions and include detailed annotations, identifications of persons and published works cited or alluded to by Hume, and a history of the editions in the Introduction. In this volume Hume's own index and a catalogue of his references are included.

The need for a new critical edition of Hume's works was first realized in 1975, the year prior to the Hume Bicentenary and the year in which work on this volume commenced. Hume scholars had increasingly begun to appreciate that available editions of Hume's works were often textually and historically inaccurate, biased in favour of certain textual interpretations, and lacking in basic information essential for scholarly work on the text. The Clarendon Hume was a response to this felt need for higher-quality editions.

The contents and principles of the critical edition were subsequently formulated in consultation with my co-editors of the Clarendon Hume, David Fate Norton and M. A. Stewart. They have been unfailing and discriminating critics of work on this volume, and their investment of time over many years has improved it in more ways than I can here mention. In recent years my conception of a comprehensive critical edition has also been enhanced by the constructive criticisms of Mark Box. I have been further aided on some matters of bibliography and annotation by Peter Fosl, Raymond Frey, David Raynor, David Owen, and James Fieser.

Sadao Ikeda, T. E. Jessop, Peter Nidditch, and W. B. Todd contributed published work on aspects of the bibliographical schema in the Introduction to this volume that must be acknowledged. Their work has been painstakingly augmented for this edition through the research of Professor Stewart. Professor Nidditch's unpublished work on Hume's essays was provided by Oxford University Press to the co-editors of the Clarendon Hume, and some

of this work has been helpful in structuring the critical apparatus in the Editorial Appendix on emendations and substantive variants.

Innumerable research assistants and librarians have helped make this edition as accurate and comprehensive as possible. I cannot hope to name them all, but special collections librarians at seven libraries deserve specific acknowledgement: the British Library, the National Library of Scotland, the Library of Congress, the Beinecke Library at Yale University, the Milton S. Eisenhower Library at the Johns Hopkins University, McGill University Libraries (Department of Rare Books and Special Collections), and the Lauinger Library at Georgetown University. My administrative assistant, Moheba Hanif, also deserves exceptional commendation for her management of the manuscript preparation.

Peter Momtchiloff has been an ideal editor in smoothing the path for production at the Oxford University Press. I must also thank Angela Griffin for her earlier work on the student edition in the Oxford Philosophical Texts series, Robert Ritter for his work on the edition of Hume's *Second Enquiry* in the Clarendon Hume, and Charlotte Jenkins for her labours on this volume. Their care in implementing conventions and achieving consistency greatly facilitated the forms adopted in this volume.

The US National Endowment for the Humanities and McGill University, contributed funds to support the early stages of this project. The Graduate School, the Department of Philosophy, and the Kennedy Institute of Ethics at Georgetown University also contributed substantially during the years of the editing.

Tom L. Beauchamp

December 1999
Chilmark, Massachusetts

CONTENTS

Abbreviations and Conventions ix
Introduction: A History of the *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* xi
A Note on the Text cv

Advertisement 1

AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING

1. Of the Different Species of Philosophy 5
2. Of the Origin of Ideas 13
3. Of the Association of Ideas 17
4. Sceptical Doubts concerning the Operations of the Understanding 24
5. Sceptical Solution of these Doubts 35
6. Of Probability 46
7. Of the Idea of Necessary Connexion 49
8. Of Liberty and Necessity 62
9. Of the Reason of Animals 79
10. Of Miracles 83
11. Of a Particular Providence and of a Future State 100
12. Of the Academical or Sceptical Philosophy 112

Editor's Annotations 124
Glossary 201
Editorial Appendix: Emendations and Substantive Variants 206
Biographical Appendix 272
Reference List 281
Catalogue of Hume's References 302
Hume's Index 307
Editor's Index 311

ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

Abstract	*An Abstract of . . . A Treatise of Human Nature*
ann.	the annotation(s) at [the following point]
Appx.	Appendix to *EPM*, designated by appendix number and paragraph number
B	The Biographical Appendix in this edition contains a biography of this person
c.	century *or* centuries
Cat.	Catalogue of Hume's References
Dial.	'A Dialogue' (published with *EPM*), designated by paragraph numbers
Dialogues	*Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*
DIS	*A Dissertation on the Passions*
EHU	*An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*
EPM	*An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*
ETSS	*Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects*
Intro.	The Editor's Introduction to the present volume
NHR	*The Natural History of Religion*
RL	Reference List (or References)
THN	*A Treatise of Human Nature*

INTRODUCTION

A HISTORY OF THE *ENQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING*

An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding (*EHU*) was published in 1748 and revised for ten subsequent editions. This Introduction treats its origins, evolution, and reception. The first four sections examine relevant facts about Hume's life, the intellectual background of the work, and its publishing history. This history includes the beginnings of *EHU* in *A Treatise of Human Nature* (*THN*), the influence of various writers and philosophers, the evolution of the editions of *EHU*, and bibliographical details. The fifth section identifies the fragments of the *Treatise* (and other early works) that remain in *EHU*, and the final three sections review the scholarly and public reception of *EHU* until Hume's death in 1776.

1. FROM THE *TREATISE* TO THE *FIRST ENQUIRY*

Hume was born on 26 April 1711, in Edinburgh, Scotland. His youth was spent in Edinburgh and Ninewells, his family's home near the English border. His father died when Hume was barely 2 years of age. His mother dedicated herself to the upbringing of her three children and never remarried.

Hume matriculated at the University in Edinburgh as a youth and studied the classics, literature, politics, philosophy, natural science, mathematics, and history. His father and maternal grandfather had been lawyers, and his family presumed that he would follow their path. He entertained this prospect, but soon became enamoured of 'philosophy and general learning'. A few years later he wrote a letter that briefly discussed these early philosophical interests and ambitions. He reported that at age 18 he was seized by an idea for a 'new Scene of Thought, which transported me beyond Measure, & made me, with an Ardor natural to young men, throw up every other Pleasure or Business to apply entirely to it'.[1] Some five years later, *circa* mid-1734,

[1] Mar. or Apr. 1734, to a doctor, *Letters*, 1: 13–14. On the origin of the *Treatise*, see also *Letters*, 1: 187. An account of Hume's early efforts to articulate his philosophy is provided by David Fate

Hume journeyed to France to study and write in seclusion. This pursuit eventuated in a draft of *A Treatise of Human Nature* by 1737. The Clarendon Hume edition of the *Treatise* contains a history of this great work, which was published in 1739–40.

Section 10 of *EHU*, on the subject of miracles, dates from work on the *Treatise* during Hume's three years in France. This section was first prepared as an essay and is among Hume's earliest writings in philosophy. In France he resided at La Flèche, in Anjou, in the same town as the acclaimed Jesuit college attended by Marin Mersenne and René Descartes[B] in the previous century. Some years later Hume recounted to a cordial clerical critic that 'Of Miracles' had its origins at this Jesuit college:

> It may perhaps amuse you to learn the first hint, which suggested to me that argument which you have so strenuously attacked. I was walking in the cloisters of the Jesuits' College of La Flèche, a town in which I passed two years of my youth, and engaged in a conversation with a Jesuit of some parts and learning, who was relating to me, and urging some nonsensical miracle performed in their convent, when I was tempted to dispute against him; and as my head was full of the topics of my Treatise of Human Nature, which I was at that time composing, this argument immediately occurred to me, and I thought it very much gravelled my companion; but at last he observed to me, that it was impossible for that argument to have any solidity, because it operated equally against the Gospel as the Catholic miracles;—which observation I thought proper to admit as a sufficient answer. I believe you will allow, that the freedom at least of this reasoning makes it somewhat extraordinary to have been the product of a convent of Jesuits, tho perhaps you may think the sophistry of it savours plainly of the place of its birth.[2]

Hume contemplated publication of the work on miracles in the *Treatise*, but by 2 December 1737 he had both a draft of the *Treatise* and a reason for withholding the essay on miracles. In a letter of this date to his friend and mentor Henry Home (1696–1782; later Lord Kames), he sent his draft along with some reservations about its publication:

> Having a frankt Letter I was resolv'd to make Use of it, & accordingly enclose some Reasonings concerning Miracles, which I once thought of publishing with the rest, but which I am afraid will give too much Offence even as the World is dispos'd at present. There is something in the turn of Thought & a good deal in the Turn of Expression, which will not perhaps appear so proper for want of knowing the

Norton in the Introduction to the *Treatise* in the Clarendon Hume. Several parts of the present edition of *EHU* are indebted to Norton's research on the *Treatise*. (All references are to works contained in the Reference List. References to the *Letters* are all to Greig's edition.)

[2] 7 June 1762, to George Campbell, *Letters*, 1: 360–1.

Context: But the Force of the Argument you'll be judge of as it stands. Tell me your Thoughts of it. Is not the Style too Diffuse? . . .

Your thoughts & mine agree with Respect to Dr Butler, & I wou'd be glad to be introduc'd to him. I am at present castrating my Work, that is, cutting off its noble Parts, that is, endeavouring it shall give as little Offence as possible; before which I cou'd not pretend to put it into the Drs hands. This is a Piece of Cowardice, for which I blame myself; tho I believe none of my Friends will blame me. But I was resolv'd not to be an Enthusiast, in Philosophy, while I was blaming other Enthusiasms.[3]

The essay on miracles therefore can be dated in draft *circa* 1736–7, with a decision made by late 1737 against immediate publication. Hume never met Bishop Joseph Butler, but he did restore the 'noble Parts' and risked offence when, a decade later, he published a collection of *Philosophical Essays*—the first edition of *EHU*. By then, Hume apparently no longer had sufficient incentive to castrate his work.

In September 1737 Hume left France and went to London to revise the *Treatise* and arrange for its publication.[4]

Disappointment with the Treatise

In January 1739, still in London, Hume published the first two volumes of the *Treatise*. In February he left for Ninewells and Edinburgh, where he resided when the third, and final, volume was published in November 1740. Reviewers misunderstood the *Treatise* and protested its obscurity and complexity.[5] Hume soon lamented its publication, but he was comforted by a confidence that errors of style and expression more than philosophical lapses created the problem. He was annoyed less by what he had argued than by the manner in which he had argued it.

Hume decided in the early 1740s that he could correct the flaws in the *Treatise* without abandoning its philosophical core. He determined to 'cast . . . anew'[6] the three books of the *Treatise* as separate publications. He recast Book 1 in 1748 as *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding* and changed its title in 1758 to *An Enquiry concerning Human*

[3] 2 Dec. 1737, to Henry Home, *New Letters*, 2–3. In the prior year Butler had published his *Analogy*.

[4] See letters to Henry Home of 2 Dec. 1737, 4 Mar. 1738, and 13 Feb. 1739, and to Michael Ramsay of 22 Feb. 1739, *Letters*, 1: 23–9.

[5] See e.g. the reviews of *A Treatise of Human Nature*, vols. 1–2, in *Commonsense: or the Englishman's Journal* (5 July 1740)—more an essay than a review; *History of the Works of the Learned*, 2 (Nov. 1739), 353–90; (Dec. 1739), 391–404; and *Bibliotheque raisonneé des ouvrages des savans de L'Europe,* 24 (Apr.–June 1740). Norton examines these reviews in his Introduction to the *Treatise*.

[6] 'My Own Life' 8, in *Letters*, 1: 3.

Understanding.[7] Shorter and stylistically more mature and polished than Book 1 of the *Treatise*, the *Enquiry*, Hume thought, retained the philosophical essentials of *Treatise* 1 while both contracting and expanding the philosophical arguments.

The Break from the Treatise

Hume's discontent with *THN* simmered for the remainder of his life. No later than 26 October 1775 he wrote a partial disavowal of the *Treatise*. It was printed in January 1776 as an 'Advertisement' (p. 1 below) to be appended to unsold and new copies of the *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects* (*ETSS*). In the Advertisement Hume judged the *Treatise* a 'juvenile work' by comparison to his later philosophy. He reported that there had been 'some Negligences in his former Reasoning', though the primary problem lay in 'the Expression'. He declared his hope 'that the following Pieces [namely, those in *ETSS*] may alone be regarded as containing [my] philosophical sentiments and principles'.[8]

The latter comment was provoked by the stubborn tendency of Hume's critics to ignore his later—and he thought more refined—expressions of his views. He regarded his critics as unfairly centring their attention on the *Treatise*, and the Advertisement gave polite notice to this provocation. The wording of the Advertisement suggests that his disappointments with the juvenile character of the work were equalled by his distaste for the distortions of short-sighted critics. Since Hume indicates that his own poor expression may have misled some critics,[9] these two reasons for his discontent appear to have been connected.

Hume's disenchantment with the *Treatise* was long-standing. In 1740 he

[7] The third book of the *Treatise* was almost wholly rewritten and published in 1751 as *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*. The second book was then lightly revised, but with massive deletions, and published in 1757 as an essay 'Of the Passions', soon thereafter altered in title to *A Dissertation on the Passions*. Hume's idea that he 'cast . . . anew' these works was no mere matter of subtracting texts and rewriting others. Unlike *DIS*, both *EHU* and *EPM* are almost entirely rewritten. *EHU* Sects. 10–11 on religion have no parallel in the *Treatise*. Recasting, it seems, means (for the two enquiries) assembling anew rather than reassembling.

[8] Advertisement, 1777 edn. of *ETSS*. (For publication details, see Sect. 4 of this Introduction.) In a letter of 26 Oct. 1775 (*Letters*, 2: 301; with a correction in a letter of 13 Nov. 1775, *Letters*, 2: 304), Hume gave instructions to his printer, William Strahan, to prefix his Advertisement to the second volume of *ETSS* and to earlier editions in the warehouse. Strahan replied to Hume's request in a letter of 30 Oct. 1775, saying the Advertisement would be 'instantly printed' and annexed to remaining copies. (Hume RSE MS (Royal Society of Edinburgh), vol. 7, moved 25 May 1987 to the National Library of Scotland, NLS MS 23157; see *Letters*, 2: 304 n. 1.) Few copies have been found, perhaps because a fire consumed the warehouse of the bookseller on 2 Mar. 1776.

[9] Feb. 1754, to John Stewart, *Letters*, 1: 187. See immediately below for the context of this letter.

was already worried about 'errors' and 'failures',[10] and in 1751 he wrote a letter stating:

> I believe the philosophical Essays contain every thing of Consequence relating to the Understanding, which you woud meet with in the *Treatise*; and I give you my advice against reading the latter. By shortening & simplifying the Questions, I really render them much more complete. *Addo dum minuo*.[11] The philosophical Principles are the same in both: But I was carry'd away by the Heat of Youth & Invention to publish too precipitately. So vast an Undertaking, plan'd before I was one and twenty, & compos'd before twenty five, must necessarily be very defective.[12]

Three years later Hume offered a similar estimate in a letter to John Stewart (1715?–1759), professor of natural philosophy at Edinburgh:

> I shall acknowledge . . . a very great Mistake in Conduct, viz my publishing at all the Treatise of human Nature, a Book, which pretended to innovate in all the sublimest Parts of Philosophy, & which I compos'd before I was five & twenty. Above all, the positive Air, which prevails in that Book, & which may be imputed to the Ardor of Youth, so much displeases me, that I have not Patience to review it.[13]

Hume is censuring himself for his performance in the *Treatise*, which he seems to have regarded as partially responsible for Stewart's misrepresentation. As in the Advertisement, he is dissuading Stewart from reading the *Treatise* and redirecting him to the later writings. Hume appears to hold to these judgments throughout his mature years, though it has never been entirely clear what he means by saying that his 'philosophical Principles are the same in both' works, and therefore not entirely clear what he regrets having published.

Hume may have formed reservations about the *Treatise*'s first and third books as early as 1739. *Circa* October or November 1739 he wrote *An Abstract of a Book lately Published; Entituled, A Treatise of Human Nature, &c*.[14] This small monograph sketched the 'CHIEF ARGUMENT' of the *Treatise* in more readily understandable terms. It did not disavow or overtly reject the doctrines, reasoning, or expression in the *Treatise*, but Hume allows on the first page that the abstractness of the *Treatise* makes readers 'apt to lose

[10] 16 Mar. 1740, to Francis Hutcheson, *Letters*, 1: 38.

[11] 'I add while I decrease in size.'

[12] Mar. or Apr. 1751, to Gilbert Elliot of Minto, *Letters*, 1: 158. By the same 'philosophical principles' Hume presumably means the same general philosophical viewpoint, not an identity of philosophical content.

[13] Feb. 1754, to John Stewart, *Letters*, 1: 187.

[14] Pub. anonymously in London. Announced in *Gentleman's Magazine*, 10 (Mar. 1740), 152. See also Hume's letter of 4 Mar. 1740, to Hutcheson, *Letters*, 1: 36–8.

the thread of argument' and acknowledges that the work 'has been complained of as obscure and difficult'.

A few summaries in the *Abstract* resemble theses found only in *EHU*, and the book of the *Treatise* emphasized in the *Abstract* is Book 1, which is the main part of the *Treatise* refashioned for *EHU*. The one thesis extensively analysed in the *Abstract* concerns causal inference and the relation of cause and effect, the centrepiece of *EHU*. This argument is the one to which he refers in the subtitle on the *Abstract*: 'THE CHIEF ARGUMENT of that BOOK'. Some statements and examples introduced in the *Abstract* are also not found in the *Treatise*, but are carried into *EHU*. It appears that Hume may have been considering how he needed to reformulate Book 1 of the *Treatise* as he wrote the *Abstract*.[15]

The full set of Hume's reasons for the disavowal of *THN* may not be recoverable, but it is probable that his 'repenting' of his early work was unfeigned and that his desire to revise it, dissuade or redirect his critics, and advance his literary reputation paved the way for his decision to draft *EHU*. On balance *EHU* is the first work in which Hume attempted systematically to repair the defects in the *Treatise* that he spotted as early as 1739 (the *Abstract* being Hume's first sketchy attempt to address defects in the *Treatise*).

The Attraction of the Essay Style

Whatever his thoughts in 1739–40 about the recasting of his philosophy, Hume did not act on them immediately. Instead, he wrote political and literary essays. The first group was published in 1741, the year after both the *Abstract* and the third volume of the *Treatise* were issued.[16] Hume's account of his first publishing activities immediately after the *Treatise* is given in 'My Own Life':

> Never literary Attempt was more unfortunate than my Treatise of human Nature. It fell dead-born from the Press; without reaching such distinction as even to excite a Murmur among the Zealots. But being naturally of a cheerful and sanguine Temper, I very soon recovered the Blow, and prosecuted with great Ardour my Studies in

[15] At the time Hume would probably have been considering a second edition of the *Treatise*. Even prior to the publication of Book 3 he wrote to Hutcheson (16 Mar. 1740, *Letters*, 1: 38–9) that: 'I wait with some Impatience for a second Edition principally on Account of Alterations I intend to make in my Performance. This is an Advantage, that we Authors possess since the Invention of Printing. . . . Without it I shoud have been guilty of a very great Temerity to publish at my Years so many Noveltys in so delicate a Part of Philosophy: And at any Rate I am afraid, that I must plead as my Excuse that very Circumstance of Youth, which may be urg'd against me.'

[16] *Essays Moral and Political* (Edinburgh, 1741).

the Country. In 1742,[17] I printed at Edinburgh the first part of my essays: The work was favourably received, and soon made me entirely forget my former Disappointment.[18]

In an 'Advertisement' in the front matter of the essays, he explained their character:

> Most of these Essays were wrote with a View of being publish'd as Weekly-Papers, and were intended to comprehend the Designs both of the Spectators and Craftsmen. . . .
>
> The Reader must not look for any Connexion among these Essays, but must consider each of them as a Work apart.[19]

Hume was enthusiastic about this project.[20] Within a year of publication there appeared both a second edition of these essays and a second volume of new essays.[21]

These 1741–2 essays enjoyed a popular success that the *Treatise* had not. The model of individual essays was a powerful stylistic attraction to Hume as he renewed his philosophical work and recast the *Treatise*. This paradigm deeply influenced *EHU*, as we will see.

Adversity in 1745

The year 1745 was one in which politics and career ambitions consumed Hume, eventuating in a profound personal disappointment. In 1744–5 Hume became a candidate for the post of professor of ethics and pneumatical philosophy at the university in Edinburgh. William Wishart (1692–1753), principal of the University, William Leechman (1706–85), professor of divinity at Glasgow, and Francis Hutcheson (1694–1746), professor of philosophy at Glasgow, among others, laboured to thwart Hume's election. Hume's alleged threat to religion and morality, which derived from his scepticism and emphasis on the severe limits of human understanding

[17] Several of the essays in the first part were initially published in 1741.

[18] 'My Own Life' 6, in *Letters*, 1: 2. Hume is exaggerating the neglect of the *Treatise*. The book was noticed by numerous critics and achieved a steadily growing reputation, including among 'the Zealots'. Hume's comment may be more an expression of his perception of its failures than an accurate accounting of its reception.

[19] *Essays Moral and Political*, 1741 edn., pp. iii, v; repeated in the 1742 edn. See Sect. 4 of this Introduction for details.

[20] 13 June 1742, to Henry Home (Lord Kames), *New Letters*, 10. (See also Hume's letter to Home of 13–15 June 1745, *New Letters*, 16–17, in which Hume describes Home as 'the best Friend, in every respect, I ever possest'.)

[21] *Essays, Moral and Political*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1742).

and reason, were at the centre of the discussion of his unsuitability for the position.[22]

Wishart circulated a hastily arranged account of some of the themes of Books 1 and 3 of the *Treatise*, mostly adapting Hume's own words for the purpose. This document typified the concerns of those who regarded Hume as an unsuitable candidate. In an attempt to defend his reputation and secure the post, Hume said he 'composed in one morning' a personal letter to the former provost of the city (1742–4), John Coutts (1699–1751). Coutts and Henry Home were Hume's chief supporters. This letter was subsequently recrafted by Home as part of a pamphlet entitled *A Letter from a Gentleman to his Friend in Edinburgh*. Publication seems not to have been at Hume's initiative, with his approval, or under his editorial control. However, Hume's philosophical goal in the letter to Coutts was to put in perspective and defend the *Treatise*—or at least the philosophy it contained—against damning charges of error.[23]

A Letter from a Gentleman says that Hume is of the opinion that he should have 'delayed the publishing of [the *Treatise*]; not on account of any dangerous Principles contained in it, but because on more mature Consideration he might have rendered it much less imperfect by further Corrections and Revisals'.[24] Six specific charges of scepticism and philosophical lapse are addressed, a matter of importance to the interpretation of *EHU* for two reasons. First, *A Letter from a Gentleman* was drafted either during or immediately prior to the bulk of the drafting of *EHU*, and a few sentences of *EHU* appear in this pamphlet. Either Hume borrowed from his draft of *EHU* in writing his letter to Coutts or he incorporated parts of the pamphlet into his drafting of *EHU*. Four of the six topics forming the charges against him are treated in *EHU*, which can be read (at least in part) as Hume's philosophical response to his accusers.

Secondly, Edinburgh clergy and town officials had at this point bared their views of the sceptical import of Hume's philosophy. Their appraisal and his failed professorial candidacy left Hume with little to gain by camouflaging his views on religion. He had previously been circumspect about publishing on or even publicly discussing matters of religion, but he dropped these reservations after the failure of his candidacy, a period that coincides with his final preparations of the manuscript of *Philosophical Essays*, that is, *EHU*. It

[22] See 4 Aug. 1744, to William Mure, and 25 Apr. 1745, to Matthew Sharpe, *Letters*, 1: 55–60. For the relevant history, including previously unpublished historical data, see M. A. Stewart, *The Kirk and the Infidel*.

[23] 13–15 June 1745, to Henry Home, *New Letters*, 14–15.

[24] *Letter from a Gentleman* 41 (citing par. nos.).

is probable that *EHU* is a deliberate reorientation of his philosophy towards various topics about which he had previously exercised prudence. In this respect, it is far more than a recasting of the *Treatise*.

Like *A Letter from a Gentleman*, *EHU* can reasonably be viewed as Hume answering his critics, rebuilding his reputation, and stating his precise and carefully qualified views about scepticism and revealed and natural religion.

Drafting the Manuscript

In 'My Own Life' Hume recalls the origin and history of *EHU*:

> I had always entertained a Notion, that my want of Success, in publishing the Treatise of human Nature, had proceeded more from the manner than the matter; and that I had been guilty of a very usual Indiscretion, in going to the Press too early. I therefore cast the first part of that work anew in the Enquiry concerning human Understanding, which was published while I was at Turin.[25]

This comment depicts *EHU* as a stylistic recasting of the *Treatise*, suggesting more novelty in style than philosophical content. However, as we have seen, there is extensive novelty in content. Hume was not merely a mature man engaged in refashioning the immature style in which his old doctrines had once been stated. He was writing a new book with new content and a new structure, and he was writing it because the *Treatise* failed adequately to represent his philosophical viewpoint.

The available evidence does not reveal a specific period of months or years that Hume dedicated to drafting *EHU*, but we know that the essay on miracles had been drafted ten years previously and that Hume had for at least six years been pondering how to recast the *Treatise*.

Once the disappointment of the failed candidacy for the position of professor was largely behind him, Hume had a few months to devote to the project of writing *EHU*. However, some unfortunate interludes may have prevented a total concentration on philosophical writing. In early 1745, while the post at the university was still pending, Hume took the job of tutor (more a superintendent) to the mentally erratic marquess of Annandale, a young patrician living in what Hume called 'Weldehall' (a specific property in the country near St Albans, called Weld Hall, then leased to the marquess). The complicated relationship between Hume and the marquess consumed far more of Hume's time and energy than he had anticipated. During the early

[25] 'My Own Life' 8, in *Letters*, 1: 3. As noted below, Hume went to Turin with General St Clair 'to attend him in his new employment at the Court of Turin' (29 Jan. 1748, to James Oswald of Dunnikier, *Letters*, 1: 108–9).

months of his stay at Weld Hall, in early June 1745 (immediately after the Edinburgh position finally disintegrated), Hume wrote to Home that 'I have Leizure enough for reading; but scarce for writing at present. However I intend to continue these philosophical & moral Essays, which I mention'd to you.'[26] That he was 'to continue' the writing certainly indicates that it was under way.

From 1746 to 1748

Almost a year later—conceivably with much or even all of the writing of *Philosophical Essays* completed—Hume left his tutorship at Weld Hall (April 1746) and travelled to London. There, unexpectedly, he became secretary to British general James St Clair (James Sinclair, birth date apparently not known, d. 1762), eventually taking part in an expedition to the coast of Brittany.[27]

During a four months' wait for orders to Brittany, Hume engaged in correspondence with Henry Home about philosophy.[28] According to an expedition notebook that Hume used as a diary, he took a box of books and paper on the expedition.[29] Hume was possibly working on or polishing parts of his philosophical writing, but he would have needed such material for the expedition. He then went to Cork and London, returning to Scotland in the spring of 1747. He soon completed, or perhaps had by then already completed, the manuscript of *Philosophical Essays*.

At one point—likely before leaving on the expedition with St Clair—Hume decided to deposit a draft of the *Philosophical Essays* (probably the only copy, as he was not in the habit of making multiple copies) with his friend James Oswald of Dunnikier (1715–69), a whig politician interested in philosophy. This deposit was presumably for safe-keeping. Oswald was in Parliament and had a secure and convenient location in London. In early October 1747 Hume wrote to Oswald:

[26] 13 June 1745, to Henry Home, *New Letters*, 18. This comment could be read as suggesting that the project was fairly new. It was in this same letter that Hume expressed reservations about Home's printing of the letter Hume had written to Coutts. *A Letter from a Gentleman* was published *c.* 21 May 1745; see, on this date, *Caledonian Mercury*, No. 3850 (Edinburgh), and *Edinburgh Evening Courant*, No. 1727. Hume was in residence at Weld Hall before 25 Apr. 1745 (see *Letters*, 1: 60). Hume had asked Home to withdraw his candidacy for the position at Edinburgh on 1 June 1745; on 19 June 1745 William Cleghorn accepted the position.

[27] See his letter to his brother John Home of Ninewells, 17 Oct. 1746, *Letters*, 1: 94–8; and both 24 July 1746 and Jan. 1747, to Henry Home, *New Letters*, 18–24.

[28] May or June 1746, *Letters*, 1: 94.

[29] British Library, Add. MS 36638. This diary was called to my attention by M. A. Stewart, who pointed out that if Hume had only one copy of the *Philosophical Essays*, he would not likely have taken it off to a war.

I have some thoughts of . . . printing the Philosophical Essays I left in your hands. Our friend, Harry [Henry Home], is against this, as indiscreet. But in the first place, I think I am too deep engaged to think of a retreat. In the second place, I see not what bad consequences follow, in the present age, from the character of an infidel; especially if a man's conduct be in other respects irreproachable.[30]

Hume obviously had already shown some portion of the manuscript to Home and was close to a decision to publish his *Philosophical Essays*. The date of this letter suggests that Home had examined the manuscript more recently than Oswald, probably in the summer of 1747, when Hume was back home and he and Home were in the same neighbourhood.

In late January and early February 1748 Hume went to London. He may have used this opportunity to deposit the *Philosophical Essays* or the third edition of *Essays Moral and Political* or both at the printer.[31] Possibly one or both had been sent up earlier. On 9 February 1748 Hume wrote to Home from London that

I leave here two works going on, a new edition of my *Essays*, all of which you have seen, except one. . . . The other work is the *Philosophical Essays*, which you dissuaded me from printing. I won't justify the prudence of this step, any other way than by expressing my indifference about all the consequences that may follow. I will expect to hear from you.[32]

It seems apparent that neither Home nor Oswald dampened Hume's ambition to publish potentially irksome essays (though it is unclear in this letter precisely which essays Hume has in mind). The 'Cowardice' that induced self-censoring a decade previously was apparently behind him.

By mid-February 1748 Hume was off with General St Clair to Europe, where he may have received the published volume of his *Philosophical Essays* in Turin. Hume recalls these travels in 'My Own Life':

[In] 1747, I received an Invitation from the General to attend him . . . in his military Embassy to the Courts of Vienna and Turin. I there wore the Uniform of an Officer, and was introduced at these courts as Aide-de-camp to the General, along with Sir Harry Erskine and Cap^{t} Grant, now General Grant. These two Years [mid-1746 to 1748] were almost the only interruptions which my studies have received during the course of my life: I passed them agreeably.[33]

[30] 2 Oct. 1747, to James Oswald of Dunnikier, *Letters*, 1: 106. See also two comments about Hume's plans and about his close relationship to Oswald in his earlier letter from Portsmouth of 23 May 1746, to Alexander Home, *Letters*, 1: 90 (written near the time of Hume's embarkation).

[31] 29 Jan. 1748, to James Oswald of Dunnikier, and 9 Feb. 1748, to Henry Home, *Letters*, 1: 108–11.

[32] 9 Feb. 1748, to Henry Home, *Letters*, 1: 111.

[33] 'My Own Life' 7, in *Letters*, 1: 2–3.

The thin set of available facts about the history of the manuscript indicates that Hume had projected the *Philosophical Essays* prior to his failure to secure the Edinburgh professorship. Hume's own reports suggest that he was more preoccupied with reading than writing in the period 1742–5 and that the manuscript of the *Philosophical Essays* was probably written primarily during the year at Weld Hall and then polished in final form after the tour of duty with General St Clair.

Changes of Title

In less than a decade Hume altered the title of *Philosophical Essays*, changing it from *Essays* to an *Enquiry*. He had adopted this second model in 1751, when he published *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*, which was his second post-*Treatise* collection of philosophical essays.[34] From a historical view of titles, the *Second Enquiry* is the first, and the *First Enquiry* the second.

As early as 1752 or 1753 Hume may have decided that his enquiries were *treatises*. He suggested as much in labelling his collected edition *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects*—or perhaps his booksellers were responsible for this title when they repackaged his work. The title *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding* was used through the 1756 edition, and as late as 5 November 1755 Hume was still freely using the title *Philosophical Essays* and referring to the contents as 'essays' in his correspondence.[35] It may not have occurred to Hume to change the title of *Philosophical Essays* until the one-volume collection of 1758 virtually forced reconsideration of the set of titles in the collection.

The words *essay*, *enquiry*, and *treatise* can be invested with too much meaning in the interpretation of this history. 'Essay' and 'treatise' are literary

[34] Hume referred to the contents of *EPM* as 'these Essays' in the first edition (1751, p. 110 n.). He changed this wording in the 1751 errata to 'this Enquiry'. His original words were no slip of the pen. In the only other self-reference to the contents of *EPM* in the first edition, Hume refers to the book as containing 'Essays' rather than 'Sections' (1751, p. 55 n., also changed in the errata). Hume apparently forgot that he had two footnotes calling it a volume of 'essays'. When he spotted the two references to essays in the footnote, it was too late to make changes in the text, but not too late to add the relevant errata.

Hume seems to have originally conceived *EPM*, like *EHU*, as an integrated sequence of independent essays. To understand that the work is a series of discrete pieces helps explain why 'A Dialogue' does not appear to be an anomaly in its position as a final essay published together with the other essays that constitute *EPM*. 'A Dialogue' is one among a series of self-standing units. Two of the appendices in *EPM* were originally written and published as integrated parts of the main essays (in later editions detached and styled 'appendices'). It seems likely that all of the appendices were originally written as parts of the main essays.

[35] See the following letters: 12 Sept. 1754, to the Abbé le Blanc, *Letters*, 1: 191–4; 5 Nov. 1755, to the Abbé le Blanc, *Letters*, 1: 225–7.

genres, but 'enquiry' suggests content rather than genre. Hume was clear neither about the precise meaning of these terms nor about his reasons for changes. None the less, Hume's title changes are revealing. They reflect shifting conceptions and directions in his work. In the 1740s he laboured more as an essayist than as a philosopher with a grand metaphysical system. The author of a systematic treatise evolved to the author of essays and from there to the author of short enquiries envisaged as sustained monographs or treatises.

2. THE INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND

A few authors and forms of literature can be said, with reasonable plausibility, to have influenced Hume's style and philosophy in *EHU*. On *style* and *form*, we know that those who wrote in the *Spectator*, *Craftsman*, and *Tatler* excited him. He admired essayist Joseph Addison[B] and other talented writers. In 'Of Essay Writing' Hume explained his conception of himself and his role as an essay writer:

> I know nothing more advantageous than such *Essays* as these with which I endeavour to entertain the Public. In this View, I cannot but consider myself as a Kind of Resident or Ambassador from the Dominions of Learning to those of Conversation; and shall think it my constant Duty to promote a good Correspondence betwixt these two States, which have so great a Dependence on each other.[36]

Writing popular essays was Hume's entrance to the role of ambassador. When he published *EHU*, he showed that he had developed a style of essay that incorporated refined philosophy. This does not mean that he had forgotten the role of ambassador: we know from Section 1 of *EHU* that he laboured to mediate between those who wrote philosophy in an 'easy and obvious' manner and those committed to an 'abstruse philosophy'.[37]

On the matter of *substantive influence*, Hume's philosophy grew out of a body of controversies in early modern European philosophy. Among the best evidence of Hume's sources are three statements he made about figures with

[36] 'Of Essay Writing' 5. This essay was withdrawn after its first publication (1742) and may not be an expression of Hume's mature views.

[37] In Section 1 he maintains that two species of philosophy need to be distinguished. Philosophy in the 'easy and obvious manner' engages, excites, and regulates sentiments of approval and blame. It shapes the conduct and affections of people. The other species is more theoretical. It enters into 'a narrow scrutiny [of human nature] . . . in order to find those principles, which regulate our understanding, excite our sentiments, and make us approve or blame any particular object, action, or behaviour' (1.2). The philosophy resulting from the combination of these two species will not be easy and obvious, but neither will it be so abstract and speculative that it cannot be confirmed in experience.

whom he was familiar and who stimulated his thinking on the topics addressed in *EHU*. First, Hume wrote a letter while still a young man in which four philosophers and works are mentioned:

> I shall submit all my Performances to your Examination, & to make you enter into them more easily, I desire of you, if you have Leizure, to read once over le Recherche de la Verité of Pere Malebranche, the Principles of Human Knowledge by Dr Berkeley, some of the more metaphysical Articles of Bailes Dictionary; such as those . . . [on] Zeno, & Spinoza. Des-Cartes Meditations woud also be useful but don't know if you will find it easily among your Acquaintances[.] These Books will make you easily comprehend the metaphysical Parts of my Reasoning.[38]

These four figures appear to be almost as important for *EHU* as they had been for the *Treatise*.

Secondly, in the *Treatise*, and again in the *Abstract*, Hume mentions John Locke,[B] Lord Shaftesbury, Bernard Mandeville, Francis Hutcheson, and Joseph Butler as 'some late philosophers in *England*, who have begun to use experimental reasoning to put the science of man on a new footing'.[39] Hume also cites Francis Bacon[B] as the father of experimental science,[40] and he attached to the first two editions of *EHU* a note of indebtedness to Hutcheson and to Butler's *Sermons*.[41]

Thirdly, in *A Letter from a Gentleman* several figures are mentioned in a manner that makes it reasonable to assume they were prominent in Hume's thinking. One footnote in *EHU* corresponds closely with a passage in *A Letter from a Gentleman*[42] in which the following figures, among others, are mentioned: Descartes,[B] the Cartesian occasionalists, Locke, Clarke,[B] and Newton.[B] Elsewhere in *A Letter from a Gentleman* several figures are mentioned whose arguments bear on various sections in *EHU*. These writers include Spinoza, Tillotson,[B] Berkeley,[B] and Malebranche[B] (the last

[38] 26 Aug. 1737, to Michael Ramsay, in Tadeusz Kozanecki, 'Dawida Hume's nieznane listy w zbiorach Muzeum Czartoryskich (Polska)', *Archiwum Historii Filozofii i Myśli Społecznej*, 9 (1963), 127–41, esp. 133–4 (from letters in the Czartoryskich Museum, Cracow, Poland, Various English Letters, 2770 IV); as pub. in Richard Popkin, 'So Hume did Read Berkeley', 774–5.

[39] *THN* Introduction 7 (note); *Abstract* 2. Particular works were not mentioned by Hume, but the years and other evidence determine that the works were Locke, *An Essay concerning Human Understanding*; Shaftesbury, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*; Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees: OR, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*; Hutcheson, *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections. With Illustrations On the Moral Sense* and *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue; In Two Treatises*; and Butler, *Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel*.

[40] Hume was fond of citing Bacon's *Novum organum*.

[41] See Hume's *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding* of 1748 and 1750 (1748: p. 15; 1750: p. 15).

[42] *EHU*, n. 16. Compare *Letter from a Gentleman* 32.

being the chief, and perhaps exclusive, Cartesian occasionalist known to Hume).[43]

Each of these figures is an important thinker for one or more subjects explored in *EHU*. The particular ways in which they were influential and their connection to specific passages in *EHU* are explored in the Annotations to the present volume. Other figures cited by Hume, including classical writers, are also known to have influenced him. These include the Pyrrhonians (especially Sextus Empiricus), the Epicureans, and Cicero[B] and the academic sceptics. (Possible Stoic influence is more speculative.) Their roles are considered further in the annotations.

Scholars of Hume's works have occasionally aspired to discover which philosopher or philosophers most deeply influenced Hume. Some have argued that a single figure or two—such as Locke[B] and Berkeley[B] in their 'empiricist' theories of ideas, Pyrrho[B] and Bayle[B] in their scepticism, Newton in his method, or Cicero in many parts of his thinking—had the deepest influence. This approach to Hume's texts and intellectual indebtedness generally does more to misrepresent than to clarify. Hume's formal education, his large correspondence, and the references and footnotes in his works indicate that he came to his doctrines, ideas, illustrations, and stories from his reading of many philosophers and non-philosophers, including several with whom he unmistakably disagreed. They all motivated his work and propelled his thinking.

In the remainder of this section the structure of *EHU* will be used to identify probable sources for each section. The emphasis is on Hume's sources, not on either the full range of sources available to him or the scope of issues current in Hume's intellectual context. No attempt is made at a complete list of sources, and many more figures at work on these topics are mentioned in the Annotations than in the present discussion. Some rehearsal of the topics and arguments in each section of *EHU* is imperative, but the goal is to identify sources, not to offer an interpretation of the text.[44]

The Ideal of a Science of Human Nature

Hume was nurtured in an enlightenment environment in which early experimental science enjoyed a remarkable reputation and influence. Like many

[43] *Letter from a Gentleman* 8, 27–8, 31–2.

[44] Writers mentioned in this section by last name only are identified by first name, nationality, lifetime dates, and the like in either the Annotations or the Biographical Appendix. The numbers that refer to passages in *EHU* are to section and paragraph numbers in the text, not to page and line numbers.

major philosophers, including Descartes,[B] Leibniz,[B] Newton,[B] Locke,[B] and Berkeley,[B] Hume saw the potential for philosophy in the scientific developments that had occurred since Bacon[B] and Galileo. Hume envisioned a philosophy that employed the experimental method to make the study of the mind more a science than a speculative metaphysics. His stated objective in the *Treatise* had been the development of a 'science of human nature'.[45] Hume mentions this project in the first sentence of *EHU* and presumably embraces it in later sections.

Though the ideal of a scientific philosophy was influential when Hume wrote, the idea of a science of the mind had rarely been mentioned by other philosophers and had never been pursued in depth. Newton had hinted that his method could be applied to a philosophy of human nature,[46] and Hobbes had offered programmatic intimations of such a project even before Newton. Newton's rejection of speculative explanations, use of controlled observations, and formulation of scientific laws struck Hume as an ideal model. It would be hasty, however, to conclude that Hume is simply a Newtonian, that he knew only the science of Newton, or that he was especially well versed in Newtonian science. Little is known about the depth of his knowledge of Newton, and there is reason to believe that Hume had a far broader vision of science than Newton's investigations. Nor would it be correct to assert that Hume's goal was more scientific than philosophical. Hume profited as much from philosophical predecessors who held that we must examine the human mind in the most careful analytical manner to ascertain its capacities and limits. Locke[B] is particularly important and is mentioned and cited in *EHU* more frequently than any other philosopher. In the first edition of *EHU* Hume mentioned Locke as having been 'really a great Philosopher, and a just and modest Reasoner', and he praised Berkeley[B] on related matters.[47]

Ideas and their Association

In Section 1 Hume states that the analysis of 'the different operations of the mind' is central to his study of human nature. He describes this project as a 'mental geography, or delineation of the distinct parts and powers of the mind' (1.13). In Section 2, 'Of the Origin of Ideas', and Section 3, 'Of the

[45] *THN* Introduction 6–7. Hume says here that his attempt 'to explain the principles of human nature' required him to propose a philosophy and system of the sciences 'built on a foundation almost entirely new'.

[46] *Opticks* 3.1.

[47] Hume characterized Berkeley as 'a great philosopher' at *THN* 1.1.7.1 and Locke 'a great philosopher' at *THN* 1.2.3.7. On scientific influences on Hume, see Michael Barfoot, 'Hume and the Culture of Science'.

Association of Ideas', he emphasizes the nature, origin, and natural association of ideas. Hume is grappling in the latter two sections with the philosophies of Descartes,[B] Malebranche,[B] Locke, Berkeley, and other philosophers who claimed that human perception, knowledge, and thought rest on ideas. Locke is mentioned in footnote 1, and again on the idea of power in footnote 12. Berkeley (as well as Bayle[B]) is mentioned in a similar context in footnote 32.[48] In the related portions of the *Treatise* there are two footnotes, one to Locke and one to Berkeley.[49] In addition, Descartes, Arnauld[B] and Nicole[B], and Malebranche[B] are among the modern philosophers known by Hume to have written on the topic.[50]

Hume maintains in Section 3 that certain ideas are naturally associated because 'principles of connexion among ideas' operate to make the connections (*resemblance*, *contiguity*, and *causation*). 'I do not find', Hume says, 'that any philosopher has attempted to enumerate or class all the principles of association' (*EHU* 3.2). This claim may be correct, but, as Hume knew, a number of philosophers had explored the association of ideas. Locke was well known for his examination of a 'natural Correspondence and Connexion' between ideas,[51] and the conviction that one type of idea naturally fosters an awareness of another idea was sufficiently prominent that Ephraim Chambers had an entry on 'Association' in his *Cyclopædia*. Some of the philosophers that Hume took most seriously had treated the subject, including Hobbes and Malebranche.[52] Hume interchangeably used the terms 'connexion' and 'association' from his first treatment in the *Treatise* through his revisions in *EHU*. It may be significant that 'connexion' was Malebranche's preferred language, that Locke's term 'association' had been used somewhat differently, and that Hume seems aware of both usages in his analysis.

Probability, Causation, Necessity, and Liberty

In Sections 4–8 Hume treats several connected topics centring on probable reasoning and causation. In Section 4 he argues that the 'foundation of all conclusions from experience' is not provided by either demonstrative or

[48] See Locke, *Essay*, Epistle, 2.1.1–24, 2.8.7–8, 4.1.1–2, 4.21.4; Berkeley, *Principles* 1.1, 4, 8, 30, 33, 39.

[49] In *THN* 1.1, 'Of ideas; their origin, composition, abstraction, connexion, &c.'.

[50] See Arnauld and Nicole, *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, chs. 1–2, 6; Gassendi, *Institutio logica* 1, esp. canons 1–4, 15; and Malebranche, *Search* 1.1.1, 3.2.1. The distant yet related topic of Descartes's method of doubt is mentioned in Section 12 of *EHU*.

[51] Locke, *Essay* 2.33 (added in the 4th edn.).

[52] Hobbes, *Leviathan* 3.1–11, treating association as a mechanistic function of mind; Malebranche, *Search* 2.1.5, 2.2.2.

matter-of-fact reasoning (4.14). This 'sceptical problem' is, at least in part, an attack on figures such as Descartes[B] and Samuel Clarke,[B 53] who regarded causes as necessarily connected to effects in a rationally discernible manner.[54] Hume's further argument that knowledge of causation arises in experience and is analysable in terms of constant conjunction appears to be his unique analysis of problems and theories about causation advanced by Malebranche[B] (and the Cartesian occasionalists), and expressed in a more veiled form in Berkeley.[B 55]

Section 5 bears the title 'Sceptical Solution of these Doubts'. Because the mind lacks the support of reason in inductive inference, another 'principle of equal weight and authority' is responsible (5.2). Hume identifies this principle in Part 1 as the 'principle [of] CUSTOM or HABIT' (5.8). In Part 2 belief is treated as a specific sentiment or feeling that accompanies the idea believed. There is no obvious candidate as the major influence on Hume's theory of belief. The importance of custom in such matters had been mentioned by several previous philosophers with whom Hume was familiar—for example, Pascal,[B] Montaigne, and Hutcheson.[56] However, these philosophers had not developed a sophisticated account of custom, and Hume's reflections in Section 5 were not thoroughly anticipated in their writings.

In Section 6 Hume discusses probability. Probable reasoning is non-demonstrative and uncertain, because there is only a likelihood of a second

[53] Clarke is cited on arguments about causation in *THN* 1.3.3.5.

[54] See e.g. Descartes's question 'how could the cause give [reality] to the effect unless it also *possessed* [it]?' (*Meditations* 3, italics added). Descartes implies that causes already contain their effects, whereas Hume regards effect-events as different from anything actually contained in the cause-events.

[55] Malebranche, *Search* 3.2.3, 6.2.2–3; Elucidation 15 (at *THN* 1.3.14.7 and note Hume specifically cites 6.2.3 and Elucidations); Berkeley, *Principles* 1.32, 103, and *Three Dialogues*, Dials. 1–2. The available evidence indicates that Malebranche was a direct influence on Hume, who may never have noticed the similarities in Berkeley's account. Malebranche analyses both physical and mental causation (other than God's) in terms of regular sequences of events discovered by experience, denies that we experience necessary connection, and incorporates this account in his views on causal inference. In *A Letter from a Gentleman* 32 Hume (or his editor, Kames) offers the following opinions: 'all the antient Philosophers agreed, that there was a real Force in Matter. . . . The Schoolmen supposed also a real Power in Matter. . . . No one, till *Des Cartes* and *Malbranche*, ever entertained an Opinion that Matter had no Force either *primary* or *secondary*, and *independent* or *concurrent*.' In *THN* Hume discusses those Cartesians who believe that 'the ultimate force and efficacy of nature is perfectly unknown to us' and who place all ultimate causation in the deity (*THN* 1.3.14.8–9). At *THN* 1.3.14.10 he notes that, to be consistent, these Cartesians should have treated efficacy in God as they had treated it in matter. See the discussion of these Cartesian 'occasionalists' in ann. 7.21 ff. below.

For others who treated some themes that anticipate Hume's conclusions, see Joseph Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica* 23 (142), 25 (154) and *Essays*, 'Against Confidence in Philosophy', 16 ff.; and Boyle, *The Christian Virtuoso* (*Works*, 5: 526–8).

[56] Pascal, *Pensées* 9, 50, 67, 94, 158–9, 454, 661, 680 (Levi nos.); Hutcheson, *Inquiry into the Original*, Treatise 1, 7.

object or event following the first. Several probability theorists had discussed whether it is possible to demonstrate the universality of propositions known by induction, but more likely influences on Hume are philosophers who associated probabilistic thinking with reasonableness in the sense that reasonable persons think in terms of probabilities when under conditions of uncertainty. Examples are found in Locke's treatment of probability and Butler's celebrated thesis about probability as 'the very guide of life'.[57] However, the literature on probability was enormous, and Hume could have drawn from many contributors.

In Sections 7 and 8 Hume explores the 'necessary connection' that joins a cause to its effect. Although numerous philosophers had regarded the necessary connection between cause and effect as a *power* in the cause, Hume argues that we neither experience such power nor have an impression of it. He notes that he is rejecting Locke's view about causal power[58] and seems no less concerned with rationalist and occasionalist theories of causation. He does not explicitly adopt the language of 'necessary connection' from the works of Descartes,[B] Spinoza, Leibniz,[B] Clarke,[B] or any so-called rationalist,[59] but there is a traceable influence from occasionalist theories, primarily Malebranche's critique of force and power.[60] Malebranche[B] is the only philosopher to use the language of necessary connection (when treating causation) in a manner relevantly similar to Hume's.[61]

In Section 8, 'Of Liberty and Necessity', Hume examines free action. He rejects theories holding that human actions are free in the sense of

[57] Locke, *Essay* 4.15; Butler, *Analogy*, Introduction. In *Abstract* 4 Hume comments on the way in which life and action depend on probability. He mentions Leibniz, Locke, Malebranche, and Arnauld and Nicole. In *THN* 1.3.11–13, which shows parallels to *EHU* 6, Hume cites Locke and uses an example found in Montaigne and Pascal (see ann. Section 6).

[58] The reference is to Locke, *Essay* 2.21.1–16. See *EHU* n. 12; *THN* 1.3.14.5 and note, where a near-identical reference to Locke occurs.

[59] Previous philosophers such as William of Ockham and Nicholas of Autrecourt may have denied necessary connection in the relevant sense. There is no reason, however, to suppose that Hume would have been directly influenced by these writers. More plausibly, Malebranche's training and interests might have brought such theories to his attention.

[60] *EHU* 7.21 (and, less directly, other pars.) is devoted to occasionalism. In a similar passage in *THN* 1.4.5.31 Hume provides a footnote to 'father *Malebranche* and other *Cartesians*'. Malebranche is similarly mentioned at *THN* 1.3.14.7. See ann. Section 7.21 for references to Cartesian occasionalist theories other than Malebranche's.

[61] *Search* 6.2.3 and Elucidation 15. Hume apparently appropriated his examples of occult qualities—bread that nourishes and senna that purges—from Malebranche (*Search* 6.2.2, p. 443). Both examples appear in Hume's *Dialogues* 4.12 in a manner similar to Malebranche's presentation. The example of bread appears several times in *EHU* (though not necessarily to illustrate occult qualities). Other passages in *THN* show a similarity to passages in Malebranche (for example, compare a near verbatim rendering at *THN* 1.3.14.7 of a passage from Elucidation 15). Malebranche appears to accept necessary connection between God and all other events, and in this respect there is a marked difference between his views and Hume's.

independent of the laws of nature and caused by the will itself. Near the beginning of this section Hume notes that the problem of liberty and necessity is a 'long disputed question'.[62] Who among the innumerable ancient, medieval, and modern writers might be most prominent in Hume's thinking is uncertain, but landmark contributions had been made in modern philosophy by Hobbes, John Bramhall, Descartes,[B] Locke,[B] and Collins. Spinoza, Leibniz,[B] and Clarke[B] might be added, but their philosophies seem distant on this topic from Hume's interests and arguments. Bramhall and Descartes offered theories that seem opposed by Hume,[63] whereas positions taken by Hobbes and Collins appear to be especially congenial to Hume's conclusions.[64] Hobbes's analysis was fundamentally similar to Hume's, and Locke's theory added new flourishes to Hobbes's.

In Section 9 Hume's accounts of causal inference, probabilistic reasoning, and belief are extended by analogy to the domain of non-human animals that perceive, apprehend, learn, deliberate, infer, believe, and the like. Although non-human animals are not perfectly analogous to humans, Hume thinks the similarities warrant the attribution of reason to animals, in the sense that they infer from cause to effect and effect to cause. Before him many philosophers, scientists, and theologians had postulated that non-human animals lack reason. Hume apparently was acquainted with some of the relevant literature in ancient thought on animals (e.g. he knew Seneca's *On Anger*, and probably Plutarch's[B] 'Beasts are Rational', as well as influential passages in Aristotle[B]).[65] Descartes's famous theory that animals are machines lacking even sensation and passion[66] was widely acknowledged in an extensive literature. Two probable sources for Hume that used favourable analogies between the human and the non-human animal were Bayle[B] and Montaigne.[67] Through Bayle Hume would have known of Thomas Willis, Ignace-Gaston Pardies, and other modern writers who had defended the position that some animals have a measure of reason.[68]

[62] *EHU* 8.2. Hume uses this same expression and provides a similar analysis in *THN* 2.3.1.1–2.

[63] Bramhall, *A Defence of True Liberty*; Descartes, *Meditations* 4, and *Principles* 1.32–9.

[64] See Hobbes, *Leviathan* 21.1–4; Collins, *Human Liberty*, preface, 11, 14–17, 36–40, 44–52, 74–5, 91–8, 110–12.

[65] See Sorabji, *Animal Minds and Human Morals*, for a comprehensive treatment of ancient philosophy.

[66] Descartes, *Discourse on Method* 5; Letters to the Marquess of Newcastle, 23 Nov. 1646, and to More, 5 Feb. 1649; 'Letter to Mersenne', 16 Oct. 1639; in *Philosophical Writings*, vol. 3.

[67] Bayle, *Dictionary*, 'Rorarius' [F–L], 'Barbara' [C], 'Pereira' [C–I]; Montaigne, 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', in *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 504–27, 531–9).

[68] Willis appealed to physiology and noted that his theory about 'reasoning and deliberation' in the brutes was developed 'analogically'; see *Two Discourses concerning the Soul of Brutes* 1, 6–7. Pardies regularly engaged in analogy in *Discours de la connoissance des bestes*.

In these six sections of *EHU* (4–9) Hume cites Locke three times, and his *Essay* is almost certainly a basic resource for Hume's treatment of all six topics. It does not follow that Hume is Locke's supporter. It is Locke's problems, distinctions, and categories that are prominent, unmistakable, and commonly identified as such by Hume.

Revealed and Natural Religion

In Sections 10, 'Of Miracles', and 11, 'Of a Particular Providence and of a Future State', Hume examines claims made on behalf of revealed and natural religion. These ventures into the philosophy of religion present a challenge to what was in Hume's time the primary philosophical defence of the Christian religion: reports of miracles in scripture and philosophical arguments for the existence and attributes of God. Much of this literature served a particular sectarian interest—for example, the interests at work in the feuds in France between Jansenists and Jesuits. Hume's thought springs from reflection on several decades of French and British publications on rational religion and lines of argument descending from the Greek and Latin classics.

In Section 10 Hume asks whether there are good reasons to believe in miracles. At stake is the credibility of the records of biblical miracles and whether those records validate the authority of those who delivered the doctrines of the Jewish and Christian dispensations. When he first wrote his essay on miracles, a large theological and philosophical literature existed on the topic. In France a lively philosophical debate about miracles had begun in the late 1650s and early 1660s, in part because of the Jansenist concerns found in Arnauld[B] and Nicole's[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking* (a book Hume refers to in his *Treatise* and *Dialogues*[69]) and related controversies over reported miracles at Port-Royal that Hume mentions in *EHU*.[70] In Britain the miracles controversy was nourished by a century of active philosophical literature. However, emphases in the two countries were noticeably different. In France *modern* miracles were under active debate, with polarized positions forming between Jansenists and Jesuits. In Britain the prevailing culture was hostile to claims of modern miracles, and the main moves in the miracles debate were anti-Catholic. Hume was engaged with the literature emanating from both countries, but sided with no particular group.

Hume begins his essay by outlining Protestant clergyman John

[69] *THN* 1.2.4.12 and note; *Dialogues* 1.15.

[70] Hume acknowledges this discussion in the lengthy footnote on Jansenist miracles that was introduced in the second edition of *EHU* (*Philosophical Essays* of 1750).

Tillotson's[B] denunciation of the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation.[71] Since transubstantiation is not a miracle or a visual sign (being patently invisible), Hume is not invoking Tillotson's authority on this subject. Rather, Tillotson's argument against the credibility of transubstantiation is being used as a beginning model for a parallel argument against miracles. Hume explicitly cites pagan treatments of miracles in Plutarch[B] and Herodotus[B] in contrast to Christian treatments in Mariana[B] and Bede,[B] hinting that weaknesses in stories told by the one group have negative implications for the stories told by the other (*EHU* 10.28–30, with also a quotation from Lucretius[B]). However, Hume's concerns are not centred on this historical literature. His emphasis is on later issues about miracles found in writers such as Grotius,[72] Hobbes,[73] Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B 74] Pascal,[B 75] Locke,[B 76] Collins,[77] Butler,[78] and two works on the French miracles[79] cited by Hume.[80]

In Section 11 Hume considers a general attitude found in Western monotheistic religious belief about order in the universe and its implications. Influential figures such as Grotius, Locke, and philosophers in the early Royal Society accepted a 'natural religion' in which the existence and activities of God were thought to be demonstrated by philosophical appeals to the order in and aesthetic character of the world. Hume emphasizes the providence of God, with auxiliary comments on immortality. This section is

[71] *EHU* 10.1. Hume (or his editor) invoked Tillotson on matters of evidence in *Letter from a Gentleman*.

[72] Grotius, *Truth of the Christian Religion* 1.18, 2.6–7, 3.7, 5.2.

[73] Hobbes, *Leviathan* 37.1–9.

[74] Arnauld and Nicole, *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, chs. 7, 12–14. This work treats probability and testimony, including the importance of relative weights of evidence. Hume had recognized its importance for 'the understanding' and 'probabilities' in *Abstract* 4.

[75] For example, *Pensées* 200, 211, 410–11, 421–50 (Levi, 60–1, 92, 94–110).

[76] *Essay* 4.15–16; *A Discourse of Miracles* (*Works*, 9: 256–65); *Third Letter for Toleration* 10. Hume uses several concepts and arguments about probability, evidence, reliability, and bias found in Locke's *Essay*. Hume's arguments appear to accept Locke's framework only to dissent from Locke's conclusion that miracles form an exceptional case to normal probability and historical judgement. Hume's enterprise sometimes seems to employ Locke's premisses to reverse his conclusions.

[77] Collins, *A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* 1.6–11.

[78] Butler, *Analogy of Religion*, Introduction, 2.2–7.

[79] Louis Basile Carré de Montgeron, *La Verité des miracles operés par l'intercession de M. de Paris, demontrée contre M. l'Archevêque de Sens; Recueil des miracles operés au tombeau de M. de Paris Diacre*; pub. with: *Second recueil des miracles operés par l'intercession de M. de Paris; Réflexions sur les miracles operés au tombeau de M. de Paris Diacre*; and *Acte passé pardevant notaires, contenant plusieurs pièces au sujet du miracle operé en la personne de mademoiselle Hardouin*. Conyers Middleton's *A Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers* may have influenced Hume's views on the importance of this literature.

[80] See the textual comparisons and arguments about lines of influence in M. A. Stewart, 'Hume's Historical View of Miracles'. See also David Wootton 'Hume's "Of Miracles"', in Stewart (ed.), *Studies in the Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment*.

partially composed as a dialogue in which a 'friend who loves sceptical paradoxes' either states Hume's arguments or puts them in the mouth of Epicurus.[B] The chief argument considered is whether God's existence can be proved from signs of order in nature that point to the creation of the universe by a wise and good divine being. Hume, like other writers of the period, uses Epicurus as an entrée to these substantive issues in philosophical theology. (See the annotations in Section 11 on how Epicurus was typecast in the literature of the period as a corpuscularian philosopher with secular leanings.)

At the time Hume wrote, influential British writers on these topics included some of the same figures mentioned above—for example, More, Wilkins, and Tillotson.[B] Other British writers with whom Hume was familiar were Clarke,[81] George Cheyne,[82] and the chevalier Ramsay.[83] Influential continental philosophers elsewhere mentioned or cited by Hume on theological matters include Descartes,[B] Malebranche,[B 84] Spinoza,[85] and Leibniz.[86] Critics of theism and religious philosophy were less abundant (Spinoza would fall in this group as well), but Hume was acquainted with assorted arguments in Cicero[B 87] and was generally familiar with the arguments in Hobbes and Bayle[B] (including Bayle's articles on Spinoza and Bellarmine[88]). He was also familiar with vexing theological questions surrounding the unorthodox beliefs of Newton,[B] Clarke,[B] and Locke.[B 89]

The latter three figures were central to philosophical reflection about rational religion when Hume wrote. However, that fact does not render transparent the precise cast of Hume's arguments in Section 11. Locke and Clarke were a priori theorists in natural religion (Clarke embracing the design argument as evidence of God's intelligence), and Newton's argument

[81] See Hume, *Dialogues* 9.7 and *NHR* n. 78.

[82] Cheyne, *Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion: Containing the Elements of Natural Philosophy*.

[83] See *NHR* n. 87 on Ramsay's *Philosophical Principles of natural and revealed Religion* 2, as well as Hume's correspondence. Hume might have been familiar with the writings of a number of other prominent figures on these subjects, such as Richard Bentley (*Eight Boyle Lectures on Atheism* and *Remarks Upon a Discourse of Free-Thinking*) and botanist John Ray (*The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of the Creation*).

[84] See Hume, *Dialogues* 2.2.

[85] See Hume's analysis of Spinoza's 'atheism' in *THN* 1.4.5.17–23.

[86] See Hume, *Dialogues* 10.6.

[87] On theological themes, see Hume's mention of Cicero in *Dialogues* 5.2; *NHR* 12.13, 24; nn. 61–2, 66–7, 72, 79, 81, 93; 'Of Suicide', n. 1. Cicero is among the most cited figures in Hume's works. However, tracing the actual lines of theological and even sceptical influence is difficult.

[88] See Bayle, *Dictionary*, 'Spinoza', esp. nn. [A], [N], [P]. At *THN* 1.4.5.22 Hume cites this article in the course of treating Spinoza's theories. In *NHR*, n. 57, Hume cites the article on 'Bellarmine'.

[89] See *NHR*, n. 78. See also *Dialogues* 1.17.

is different from those Hume actually treats. Hume's context is broader and appears to centre on Christian writers with an aesthetic vision of an ordered universe, such as Hutcheson.

Which among these figures may have been of special significance for Hume is difficult to determine, but it seems beyond reasonable doubt that the above constellation of figures forms his intellectual context.

Scepticism

Early in his career Hume seemed to encourage the interpretation of his philosophy as sceptical. He wrote in the *Abstract* of his *Treatise* that 'the philosophy contain'd in this book is very sceptical, and tends to give us a notion of the imperfections and narrow limits of human understanding'.[90] Later he became sensitive to charges of a corrosive scepticism in his writings and attempted to avoid misinterpretations. *A Letter from a Gentleman* is an indicator of his early sensitivity, just as the *Advertisement* issued in 1776 reflects his later feelings.

By the time Hume wrote the last section of *EHU*, he had been publicly accused of a scepticism dangerous to religion and morals. In this section he distinguishes several classifications of types of scepticism, abandons mention of several sceptical arguments addressed in the *Treatise*, and mentions several new glosses on scepticism not found in the *Treatise*. The schools and figures uppermost in his thought are the academic sceptics (chiefly as presented by Cicero[B]), the Pyrrhonian sceptics (relying on Sextus Empiricus, or at least certain representations of his views), Descartes[B] (the method of sceptical or universal doubt), and Berkeley[B] (on scepticism with regard to the senses). We can confidently mention the influence of at least Bayle's articles on Pyrrho[B] and Zeno,[91] and Hume had read relevant parts of Montaigne,[92] Bishop Huet,[93] and Locke.[B 94]

Midway through Section 12 Hume compares and assesses the Academics

[90] Hume, *Abstract* 27.

[91] See Bayle, *Dictionary*, 'Pyrrho', 'Zeno'; and see also 'Spinoza'. Hume's extremely brief discussion in Section 12 of what was called 'scepticism with regard to reason' in *THN* involves appeal to problems of infinite divisibility that correspond to arguments and distinctions in the article on Zeno. Hume had been interested in Bayle even before the *Treatise*, as citations in his early memoranda may indicate (Mossner, 'Hume's Early Memoranda').

[92] Especially 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', in *Essays* 2.12.

[93] At *Dialogues* 1.17 (and note) and again in *Letter from a Gentleman* 24, Hume mentions the remarkable Pyrrhonian work by Bishop Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630–1721), *A Philosophical Treatise concerning the Weakness of Human Understanding* (a translation from the 1723 French edition). The union of Roman Catholicism and Pyrrhonism in this work provoked Hume's curiosity as well as that of the Jesuits. Like Bayle, Huet provides synopses of the representations in Sextus Empiricus.

[94] Locke's influence in the area of sceptical arguments is less easy to trace, but may be as significant as his influence in other areas.

and the Pyrrhonians. Although Pyrrhonism is said to serve a useful philosophical purpose by deflating undue philosophical pride and pretentiousness (12.21–4),[95] Hume expresses reservations about it (12.21) as well as about the kind of antecedent doubt that he attributes to Descartes (12.2–3).[96] Hume also examines sceptical questions regarding whether objects and events are nothing but perceptions (12.9). Here he appears less concerned with ancient scepticism than with the roots of scepticism about the senses in Locke and Berkeley (12.9–12, 15–16), especially Berkeley. Hume accepts the drift of Berkeley's criticism of Locke[97] and then proceeds to dispute Berkeley's conclusion that bodies are nothing but perceptions (see 12.15 and n. 32). Hume says that 'philosophy finds herself extremely embarrassed' (12.10), because philosophers are unable to justify either the claim that trees and houses are nothing but perceptions in the mind (Berkeley's theory) or the claim that perceptions in the mind are caused by external objects (Locke's theory).

Section 12, then, is a mosaic of Hume's insights into the benefits and limits of Pyrrhonism, academic scepticism, Cartesian scepticism, and Berkeley's scepticism. Even if Hume rejects most of the positions in these philosophical systems, this would not alter the fact that these figures and schools, together with Locke and Bayle, appear to provide the philosophical foundations of his thought in Section 12.

3. A HISTORY OF THE EDITIONS

Hume's drafting and distributing of the manuscript of *EHU* as well as his work on his first edition at the press were treated in Section 1 above. Hume's substantive and formal corrections in the editions will be discussed in the Editorial Appendix. The history of the editions of *EHU* is examined in the present section.

The First Edition in 1748

According to the ledgers of Hume's printer, William Strahan (1715–85),[98] the *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding* was printed in

[95] In his *Abstract* 27 Hume attributes monumental weight to Pyrrhonian reasoning: 'Philosophy wou'd render us entirely *Pyrrhonian*, were not nature too strong for it.' Again in *EHU* 12.21 he emphasizes the philosophical attractions of Pyrrhonian principles, noting that it is 'difficult, if not impossible, to refute them'.

[96] See Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy* 1 (*Philosophical Works*, 2: 15).

[97] Berkeley, *Principles* 1.18–24.

[98] These printing-account ledgers (and other business papers) are housed in the British Library, Add. MSS 48800–48919. The 48800 and 48801 vols. (BL Add. MSS 48800–48801) are vols. 1 and

April 1748 (750 copies). A nearby entry in Strahan's ledgers (September 1749) is to the second edition (1750) of this work (1,250 copies). The dates indicate the rapidity with which Hume set out to revise this work. In March 1751, 1,000 copies of a new title-page for the second edition were printed by Strahan for an issue to be sold by M. Cooper, under the 1751 date (a not uncommon device when unaltered sheets are reissued in a new form). Except for the new title-page, with its new bookseller and date, this reissue is exactly the same as the 1750 edition.

Hume's account in 'My Own Life' of the publication of *EHU* (as previously quoted) needs correction and augmentation in two respects. First, the book was actually published before his period in Turin (where he arrived shortly after 13 May 1748[99]), although he may have received his first copy in Turin. Secondly, Hume says that

> [My *Philosophical Essays*] was at first but little more successful than the Treatise of human Nature. On my return from Italy, I had the Mortification to find all England in a Ferment on account of Dr. Middleton's Free Enquiry;[100] while my Performance was entirely overlooked and neglected. A new Edition, which had been published at London of my Essays, moral and political, met not with a much better reception.[101]

The *Philosophical Essays* may have been ignored from the author's perspective, but, as we will see (in Sections 6–8), Hume's account of the matter suggests that he misremembered the response to the *Philosophical Essays*.

The Second Edition in 1750

On 18 April 1750 Hume wrote that his bookseller, Andrew Millar (1707–68), 'had printed off some Months ago a new Edition of certain philosophical Essays; but he tells me very gravely, that he has delay'd publishing because of

2 of the expenses, receipts, and payments accounts. Vol. 1 starts in 1739 (roughly Mar.) and retains a full record of accounts with authors and booksellers until 1768 (with credits and payments running until 1773). The file for Hume's publisher, Andrew Millar, continues until Sept. 1769. Vol. 2 begins in 1768 and runs through 1785. For other details of these ledgers and the history of Strahan as a printer, see Hernlund, 'William Strahan's Ledgers', 89–111, esp. 90–3; Cochrane, *Dr. Johnson's Printer*, 7–12; and Philip Gaskell, 'The Strahan Papers', 592. My interpretation of these ledgers does not always agree with views expressed by these scholars.

[99] See *Letters*, 1: 132.

[100] Between Hume's first and second editions, English controversialist and clergyman Conyers Middleton (1683–1750) published *A Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers* (1749, though advertisements indicate that the book was first published in Dec. 1748); this book contained some views on miracles that resembled Hume's. See ann. 94.1.

[101] 'My Own Life' 8, in *Letters*, 1: 3.

the Earthquakes'.[102] The second edition was published by 10 April 1750, six months after it was printed. This edition differed from the first in at least one striking detail. In 1748 there was printed on the title-page 'By the AUTHOR of the ESSAYS MORAL and POLITICAL', whereas in 1750 Hume's name appeared. Late in 1748 Hume apparently changed his mind and for the first time began to affix his name to his works (the initial volume being the 1748 grouping of essays entitled *Three Essays, Moral and Political*). Henceforth Hume retained the policy of using his name for all major works.

The Earliest Collected Editions: 1753–1756

The marketing of the fourth edition of *Essays, Moral and Political* in 1753 betokened a new conception of Hume's post-*Treatise* writings, which were collected under the title of *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects*. Thereafter new editions would all preserve this title.

In April 1753 Hume's printer, Strahan, recorded printing the new edition of Hume's *Essays* (*Essays, Moral and Political*) and 500 copies of 'titles for 4 vols. of D°'. These titles were new title-pages for the pre-1753 stock of the works that were to become the constituents of the collected *Essays and Treatises*. Along with a new fourth edition of *Essays, Moral and Political* (designated Volume 1), the bookseller reissued the third edition of the same work, with the same volume number and date, but erroneously called the 'Fourth' edition. The editions were more carefully distinguished for the other works. The reissue of the *Philosophical Essays* as Volume 2 was correctly designated the second edition; that of the *Political Discourses* as Volume 4, the third edition. The reissue of *EPM* as Volume 3, being still the first edition, was unnumbered. In short, the four existing volumes were reissued with cancel title-pages all dated 1753; some of the collections included a revised and reset fourth edition of *Essays, Moral and Political*, the only genuinely new component.

Copies of old and new editions of the individual volumes probably coexisted in the bookseller's stock for some time, as first one and then another work was revised and reset.[103] Between 1753 and 1758, as new editions appeared, a bookseller might have on the shelves any of various combinations of the editions of the individual works. By 1756 the whole of the first

[102] 18 Apr. 1750, to John Clephane, *Letters*, 1: 141. A major earthquake affected business in London in 1750.

[103] The evidence for this claim is in the number of mixed sets surviving in libraries. It cannot be more than probable that this explanation is the correct one, because we cannot rule out that individual volumes were purchased separately over several years.

collected edition of *Essays and Treatises* of 1753 had evolved into a new, revised edition consisting of the following components: *Essays, Moral and Political*, the true fourth edition (still dated 1753); *Philosophical Essays*, third edition (1756); *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*, second edition (1753); *Political Discourses*, third edition (1754).[104]

The first collected edition was, then, created from a miscellany of editions and issues. The second edition of the *Philosophical Essays* was retained without alteration, except for a new volume title-page that denominated it as Volume 2. This was not a new edition in any respect. To summarize, the first '1753' collected edition was as shown in Table 1.[105]

TABLE 1. *The first '1753' collected edition*

Volume	Title	Edition
1	*Essays, Moral and Political*	3rd [1748]
2	*Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding*	2nd [1750]
3	*An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*	1st [1751]
4	*Political Discourses*	2nd [1752]

TABLE 2. *The final 1753–6 collected edition*

Volume	Title	Edition
1	*Essays, Moral and Political*	4th [1753]
2	*Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding*	3rd [1756]
3	*An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*	2nd [1753]
4	*Political Discourses*	3rd [1754]

After piecemeal replacement, the 'first collected edition' evolved into the new collection depicted in Table 2.[106]

A common feature of all versions of the first collected edition is that each

[104] In the intervening years, and probably beyond, purchasers might acquire different permutations of the individual editions. Those who read their title-pages carefully could work out the various possible combinations, except for misnumbered *Essays*. No evidence indicates that the coexistence of different editions led to any serious mixing of the sheets for each.

[105] This accounting was initiated by A. Wayne Colver, 'The "First" Edition of Hume's Essays and Treatises', 39–44.

[106] Libraries throughout the world have often been confused about the histories of dating and printing given in Table 1. Some have miscatalogued their collections—mistaking second editions for third editions, and the like. A few libraries have mixed early volumes with late volumes, under the assumption that only one set of 1753–6 (or merely a set of 1753) volumes was published.

philosophical work was given a volume number that remained constant throughout the course of these changes. In later collections, only volumes that collected more than one of the above works would be numbered, and these volumes assumed a very different character. Since the *Philosophical Essays* of 1756 was the last of the volumes issued, it was the last philosophical work by Hume to carry a volume number. Late in this same year Hume wrote to Millar that he was eager for all of his works to be collected in a new unified edition: 'I am extremely desirous to have these four Volumes, with that which you will publish this Winter [the *Four Dissertations*], brought into a Quarto Volume.'[107] This desire would be satisfied with the edition of 1758.

The Collected Editions from 1758 to 1770

In 1757 Hume published his *Four Dissertations*, which in the 1758 edition provided four new essays to add to his collected works. His labours in perfecting the works in *Essays and Treatises* prompted this comment: 'These Writings have already undergone several Editions, and have been very accurately examind every Impression; yet I can never esteem them sufficiently correct.'[108] Hume was poised for a stream of corrections.

With the new additions in 1758, Hume's post-*Treatise* philosophy became fixed in structure for the remainder of his lifetime. The 1758 edition was published in a single handsome quarto volume,[109] at the beginning of which Hume placed the following 'Advertisement' (p. iii):

> Some Alterations are made on the Titles of the Treatises, contained in the following Volume. What in former Editions was called *Essays moral and political*, is here entitled *Essays, moral, political, and literary, Part* 1. *The political Discourses* form the *second Part*. What in former Editions was called, *Philosophical Essays concerning human Understanding*, is here entitled *An Enquiry concerning human Understanding*. The *four Dissertations* lately published[110] are dispersed thro' different Parts of this Volume.

The 1758 edition constituted both a permanent canon of Hume's writings produced after 1740, other than his *History* and posthumous works, and a return (in the second half of the collection) to the order and arrangement of

[107] 4 Dec. 1756, to Andrew Millar, *Letters*, 1: 236.

[108] 1 Feb. 1757, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 1: 241.

[109] In the 1758 and later editions the various works were collected in two primary parts—the *essays* and the *treatises*, Hume implies—whether the editions were issued as one, two, or four volumes. However, Hume never explicitly divided his Contents pages by using terms such as 'part' or 'treatise'.

[110] Printed in London and pub. Feb. 1757.

topics in the three books of *A Treatise of Human Nature*. *EHU* always appeared immediately before *A Dissertation on the Passions* and *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*.

Throughout his post-1758 editions Hume was fastidious in altering his punctuation, spelling, and choice of words. Most of his changes were word substitutions, small clarifications and deletions, and stylistic improvements, together with attempts to improve the quality of argument.[111] Hume was a scrupulous editor. The spirit of his alterations is captured in a self-description of his revisions of his *History*:

> one reason of my remaining in London is the correcting a new Edition of my History, which I oversee as anxiously, as if any body were concern'd about it, or ever woud perceive the Pains I take in polishing it and rendering it as accurate as possible. I can only say, that I do it for myself and that it amuses me.[112]

The corrections made and the dating of the types of change introduced are discussed in the Introduction to the volume of his *Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals* in the Clarendon Hume. These changes include spelling, the use of contractions, systematic word substitution, use of small capitals, and the like. These corrections need no further review here, but commentary is needed regarding changes in the 1767 and 1768 editions, which were subsequently mislaid in 1770, and then lost to the later editions.

The 1767 edition introduced numerous modifications of the 1764, and the 1768 edition was based on an extensive stylistic revision of the 1767 edition. Hume invested heavily in the 1768 edition, attending even to the appearance of the volume. In the spring of 1767 he wrote to his printer: 'I send you a Volume of [Joseph] Olivet's Cicero at Mr Millar's Desire, who proposes instantly to begin an Edition of my Essays in that Form, as a Forerunner to the like Edition of my History.'[113]

In both the 1767 and 1768 editions Hume made a concentrated attempt to reduce inconsistent usage. However, collation of the variants indicates that when he prepared the 1770 edition he almost certainly prepared his changes for the printer on a copy of an edition other than the 1768 edition.[114] Because

[111] 24 Sept. 1752, to Adam Smith, *Letters*, 1: 167–9; 15 Mar. 1753, to James Balfour, *Letters*, 1: 172–4; 4 Sept. 1771, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 249–50; 2 Jan. 1772, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 251–2.

[112] 18 Oct. 1768, to Baron Mure of Caldwell, *Letters*, 2: 187–9. Less than a year before writing this letter, Hume completed changes for the eighth edition of *EHU*.

[113] Spring 1767 (*c.* 10 Mar. 1767), to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 125.

[114] The 1768 edition was a sumptuous product, a beautifully polished two-volume quarto and the only copy of *Essays and Treatises* to survive Hume in the Hume Library (Norton and Norton, *Hume Library*, 104, no. 653). It is possible that he did not wish to mark up this edition. The more likely explanation, however, is that Hume's printer preferred to model the octavo 1770 edition on a prior octavo edition. This hypothesis is explored below.

many of the words and forms in the 1768 edition were never recovered in the 1770, 1772, or 1777 editions, the 1768 edition has occasionally been given a special authority for a limited group of emendations in the present edition.

A natural assumption is that Hume used the 1767 edition as the basis of the 1770 edition. A ready hypothesis points in this direction: When a printer set an edition in a particular size and format in the eighteenth century, it was common (though not absolutely normal) for the printer to model the new edition directly on the last edition in the same size and format. This is partly to try to preserve the same pagination (an unattainable goal if numerous authorial changes have been made), but a more pragmatic reason for using the same format is that a previous edition of the same type will already have solved certain problems about layout, type size, and the like, which will then not have to be planned afresh. Hume's compositors would presumably have preferred to set the octavo 1770 edition from a previous octavo edition with the same capitalizations, uses of asterisks, obeli, etc. Certain details that fit a quarto are simply not suitable for an octavo. The 1768 is a quarto, and the 1770 is a small octavo; the 1767 is also an octavo.

However, the hypothesis that Hume used the 1767 edition as the basis for his 1770 edition is not promising. Collation of both the formal and the substantive variants strongly indicates that a large number of the changes entered in the 1767 edition were lost, just as the changes entered in the 1768 edition were lost. Most of these 1767 and 1768 changes do not appear to be of the sort that Hume would have intentionally abandoned at a later date. It seems unlikely, on any evidentiary basis, that the 1767 was the basis of the 1770 edition.

There may, none the less, be sound logic in the interpretation that the printer used an octavo edition as the basis of the 1770 edition. The 1764 edition is also an octavo. Perhaps the printer requested an octavo, and the only one readily available for the task was a copy of the 1764 edition, which by default became the marked-up basis of the 1770 edition. Though it seems odd to have abandoned the corrections in the 1767 and 1768 editions, the collation of the editions strongly points in the direction of 1764 as the base edition.

The salient facts about formal and substantive changes in the editions of *EHU* from 1764 to 1770 are the following:[115] 152 changes were introduced in 1767 that were carried into 1768, and then omitted in 1770. (Another sixty-five changes introduced in 1768 were also lost in 1770.) Twenty-three

[115] These figures are compiled from collation of both accidental and substantive variants. All figures are for *EHU* only; but the pattern does not vary in other works in *ETSS*. Typographical errors are excluded from these counts.

changes were made in 1767 that were omitted in 1768, and then never reappeared in 1770 or in any later year. A large percentage of these twenty-three changes could be interpreted as subtle typographical errors that a careful reader would have noticed in preparing the 1768 edition. *There are zero instances of a word or form that occurred in 1767, did not occur in 1768, and then reappeared in 1770*. Every word or form that appears in 1767 but not in 1768 was lost in 1770 (and in every later edition).

By sharp contrast, there are 169 instances in *EHU* of words and forms that appeared in 1764, were changed in 1767 to a different word or form, and then the 1764 word or form reappeared in the 1770 edition. The correlation between the 1764 and the 1770 editions is, in fact, extremely strong (throughout *ETSS*) in every respect one would expect of an edition that followed a direct predecessor. This evidence (when joined with the negative evidence of a correlation in the 1767 and 1768 editions) strongly indicates that the 1764 octavo edition was the model for the 1770 small octavo. This circumstance explains why so much material in the 1768 edition was lost.

Presumably the compositor set type from the 1764 edition, using the same format, feeding into the 1770 the substantive (and some accidental) corrections marked by Hume on the copy of the 1764 edition. Using this method there is no reason to expect that Hume would notice unmarked divergences between the 1768 edition and the edition that he marked for the printer.

The 1772 Copytext and Final 1777 Changes

Almost as soon as Hume received copies of the 1770 edition, he began to make corrections for the next edition of 1772,[116] the last edition he saw through the press. In revising for this edition, Hume reported that he had examined his work 'carefully *five times over*'.[117] In another letter he remarked on the quality, and likely the finality, of his corrections:

> This is the last time I shall probably take the pains of correcting that work, which is now brought to as great a degree of accuracy as I can attain; and is probably much more labour'd . . . than any other production in our Language. This Power, which Printing gives us, of continually improving and correcting our Works in successive Editions, appears to me the Chief Advantage of that Art.[118]

[116] 21 Jan. 1771, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 233–5: 'I shall read over several times this new Edition; and send you a corrected Copy by some safe hand.'

[117] 11 Mar. 1771, to William Strahan (italics added), *Letters*, 2: 235.

[118] 25 Mar. 1771, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 239.

Hume's correspondence indicates intensive concentration on—'I dedicate my time entirely to it'[119]—and satisfaction with the 1772 edition. This concentration and care helped make it easy to choose this edition as copytext for the present edition, while also accepting the major substantive changes from the posthumous 1777 edition. (See, further, the Editorial Appendix in the endmatter of this volume.)

Despite his satisfaction with the 1772 edition, Hume prepared corrections for his final lifetime edition, published in 1777. Strahan asked Hume for corrections in a letter of 12 April 1776,[120] and on 20 April—four months before his death—Hume informed Strahan that 'I bring up my philosophical Pieces corrected, which will be safe, whether I dye by the Road or not.'[121] Sensitive to Hume's declining health and worried about incompleteness in the revisions, Strahan worked on the volume almost immediately.[122]

Hume was understandably less organized in putting together his corrections for what would be the posthumous edition. In late July 1776 he sent additional corrections, including a major structural change in his arrangement of the sections and appendices of *EPM*. Strahan replied on 1 August 1776 that work was progressing on the editions (the *History*, in particular). He then reassured Hume about the reward in store for his labours: 'I see clearly your reputation is gradually rising in the public esteem. A flattering circumstance this, even in the decline of life, and when, by the unalterable course of nature, nothing will soon be left of us but a *name*.'[123] Thirteen days before his death Hume sent yet another significant change to Strahan with these comments: 'This, Dear Sir, is the last Correction I shall probably trouble you with: For Dr Black[124] has promised me, that all shall be over with me in a very little time.'[125]

Hume's posthumous *Essays and Treatises* of 1777 was not printed for more than a year after his death. The reason for the delay is not known. Hume's friend Adam Smith (1723–90) had offered to 'revise the sheets' of Hume's 1777 edition,[126] but no evidence indicates that Smith contributed to the 1777 corrections.

[119] 4 Sept. 1771, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 250.

[120] Hume RSE MS (Royal Society of Edinburgh), vol. 7, moved 25 May 1987 to the National Library of Scotland, NLS MS 23157.

[121] 20 Apr. 1776, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 315.

[122] See Burton (ed.), *Letters of Eminent Persons Addressed to David Hume*, 102–3.

[123] *Letters of Eminent Persons*, 104.

[124] Joseph Black (1728–99), Edinburgh professor, chemist, and physician.

[125] 12 Aug. 1776, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 331–2.

[126] See 22 Aug. 1776, to David Hume, and 5 Sept. 1776, to William Strahan, in Smith, *Correspondence of Adam Smith*, 206, 211.

Printer and Booksellers

The editions of *EHU* that Hume polished for almost three decades were the products of collaboration throughout this period with his printer, William Strahan, his bookseller until 1767, Andrew Millar, and his bookseller thereafter, Thomas Cadell (1742–1802), who was Millar's partner after 1765 and from 1758 to 1765 his apprentice. Strahan was a master printer and owner of what became the largest printing house in London. Millar set up shop in the Strand in 1728 and became a bookseller of the works of several distinguished authors. The later bookseller, Cadell, was also prominent in his trade.[127]

Hume's personal relationship with all but Cadell began in 1748 with the publication of *Philosophical Essays* and *Three Essays, Moral and Political*. Strahan printed Hume's *Abstract* and served as Hume's printer for all editions of *EHU*, and Millar was bookseller for all until his death in 1767. The history of Hume's relationship with his printer and booksellers and the nature of the printing and bookselling industries is explained in the Clarendon edition of *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*, and for this reason only a few salient features of this history will be mentioned here.

As he worked with Strahan, Hume's manuscript habits and preferences became intermixed with print-shop practices. Rotating sets of compositors brought different standards to the work, and conventions varied across the editions. Hume's text progressively became a joint and evolving product of the writing–printing–bookselling industry. Hume acknowledged this fact by pointing to the skills that Strahan and his workers exhibited in proper composition, correcting proofs, helping with indexing, and the like.

Hume felt supremely confident about Strahan's and Millar's competence and trustworthiness, and both were personally attached to Hume. A history of reciprocated good will is apparent in their long correspondence.[128] Hume travelled to London to oversee printing and correction, corresponded about corrections and composition, regularly examined proofs, and com-

[127] J. A. Cochrane, *Dr. Johnson's Printer*; Colin Clair, *A History of Printing in Britain*; P. M. Handover, *Printing in London: From 1476 to Modern Times*; Alvin Kernan, *Printing Technology, Letters, & Samuel Johnson*; H. R. Plomer, G. H. Bushnell, and E. R. McC. Dix, for the Bibliographical Society, *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726 to 1775*.

[128] For example, see 22 Feb. 1772, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 259; 1 Feb. 1757, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 1: 241; *Letters of Eminent Persons*, 86; Correspondence, British Library, Add. MSS 4314, 6190; Mumby and Norrie, *Publishing and Bookselling*, 153–4.

piled errata.[129] In July 1771 he wrote to Strahan about his fascination with style, corrections, and proper forms of publication:

I know not whether the former purchasers may complain of my frequent Corrections; but I cannot help it, and they run mostly upon Trifles; at least they will be esteemd such by the Generality of Readers, who little attend to the extreme Accuracy of Style. It is one great advantage that results from the Art of printing, that an Author may correct his works, as long as he lives.[130]

Although the history of Hume's editions of *EHU* sketched in this section has been brief, more detail about his plans and revisions is provided in the Editorial Appendix, especially in the explanation of the evolution of the text that precedes the list of variants (pp. 206–19).

4. A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SCHEMA OF THE EDITIONS

The texts of eleven 'editions' of *EHU* were authorized by Hume up to and including the posthumous edition of 1777. The following bibliographical data include details of the printing and publishing histories of *EHU* as a single volume and of the relevant volumes of each of the collected editions of *ETSS* in which *EHU* appeared.[131] Foreign-language editions in Hume's lifetime are included at the end of this section.

All the primary editions are printed on laid paper, normally unwatermarked, with the exception of 1770, for which separate details are provided below. The chain lines in the octavo volumes are vertical, and in the duodecimo and quarto horizontal. In all editions there are catchwords on each text page except the last, with minor inconsistencies of practice on Contents pages and on pages immediately preceding the titles of major divisions. In the transcriptions of the title-pages, lower-case 's', whether roman or italic,

[129] Formal errata were published in four editions of *EHU*, as front matter in 1750, and as endmatter in 1753, 1756, and 1758.

[130] 22 July 1771, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 246–7. Cf. 18 Apr. 1757 and 3 Sept. 1757, both to Strahan, *Letters*, 1: 247, 267.

[131] The bibliographical descriptions below often draw on the research of M. A. Stewart. A useful source that helped confirm some parts of the bibliographical information is Chuo University, *David Hume and the Eighteenth Century British Thought*. Where the editions recorded are common to *EHU* and *EPM*, they have already been described in the Introduction to the Clarendon edition of *EPM*. Some of those accounts have been revised here in the light of further bibliographical analysis. I am indebted to Jane Roscoe and Mark Box for discoveries of advertisements in British newspapers and periodicals.

is to be read as long 's' if it is not the last letter of a word, and as long 's' within a ligature if it occurs in the combination 'st'.

1748

Title. PHILOSOPHICAL | ESSAYS | CONCERNING | Human Understanding. | By the AUTHOR of the | ESSAYS MORAL and POLITICAL. | (Floral ornament) | *LONDON:* | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite *Katharine-Street*, | in the *Strand*. MDCCXLVIII.

Collation. 12°: π^2 A–K^{12} L^8 M^2 [$6 (–L5–6, *M*1–2) signed; B5 misnumbered B4]; 132 leaves; pp. *i–ii*, iii–iv 1–256 *257–60*.

Contents. $\pi 1^r$ title as above, verso blank; $\pi 2^{r–v}$ CONTENTS; $A1^r$–$L8^v$ text ($A10^v$, $B3^v$, $B11^v$, $D10^v$, $E1^v$, $F4^v$, $G10^v$, $H2^v$, $I6^v$, $K7^v$ blank); $M1^r$–$M2^v$ bookseller's announcements.

Text:[132] *Philosophical Essays*, Essay I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 1–19); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 21–9); III, Of the connexion of ideas (pp. 31–45); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 47–68); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 69–91); VI, Of probability (pp. 93–97); VII, Of the idea of power or necessary connexion (pp. 99–127); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 129–63); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 165–71); X, Of miracles (pp. 173–203); XI, Of the practical consequences of natural religion (pp. 205–29); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy[133] (pp. 231–56).

Production. 750 copies, printed April 1748 (11 sheets at £1. 8*s*., total £15. 8*s*.).[134]

Publication. Around 22 April 1748. Price 3*s*. (5*s*. for 'Two Neat Pocket Volumes') bound.[135]

Variant states. 1. Some copies lack sheet *M* containing the booksellers' announcements. 2. In at least one copy sheets π and *M* have not been segre-

[132] Details supplied under the heading 'Text' relate solely to contents designated as 'text' in the preceding formula.

[133] In the table of contents of the 1748–56 editions: 'Of the sceptical or academical philosophy'.

[134] See Strahan Ledgers, British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 65. In this and all further references to the Strahan ledgers, the foliation follows Strahan's own numbering, which assigns to *facing* debit and credit sides the number recorded on the recto. Costs supplied in parentheses are the production costs (Strahan's charges to the bookseller).

[135] *General Advertiser*, 19–21, 22–3, 26 Apr. 1748; *General Evening-Post*, 16–19, 23–6 Apr. 1748; *Whitehall Evening-Post*, 16–19 Apr. 1748; *London Evening-Post*, 23–6 Apr. 1748; *Scots Magazine*, 10 Apr. 1748, 208; *Gentleman's Magazine*, Apr. 1748, 192.

gated, where the preliminary leaves follow the order *M*1 π1–2 *M*2.[136] 3. In one copy G8^{v} carries the erroneous page number 1660, for 160.[137]

Watermarks. Initials, unidentified.

1750

Title. PHILOSOPHICAL | ESSAYS | CONCERNING | Human Understanding. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | The SECOND EDITION. | With Additions and Corrections. | (Floral ornament) | *LONDON:* | Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite to *Katharine-* | *Street*, in the *Strand*. MDCCL.

Collation. 12°: π^{2} A–K^{12} L^{10} [$6 (–L6) signed]; 132 leaves; pp. *i–ii*, iii *iv* 1–259 *260* (3 or 6 lacking page numbers in some copies; 223 sometimes misnumbered 22).

Contents. π1^{r} title as above, verso blank; π2^{r} CONTENTS; π2^{v} ERRATA (12½ + 4½ lines) A1^{r}–L10^{v} text (A10^{v}, B3^{v}, D10^{v}, E1^{v}, F4^{v}, G10^{v}, I8^{v}, K9^{v} blank); L10^{v} A note to page 180.

Text: *Philosophical Essays*, Essay I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 1–19); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 21–29); III, Of the connexion of ideas (pp. 31–46); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 47–68); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 69–91); VI, Of probability (pp. 93–97); VII, Of the idea of power or necessary connexion (pp. 99–127); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 129–63); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 165–72); X, Of miracles (pp. 173–207); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state[138] (pp. 209–33); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy[139] (pp. 235–59); A note to page 180 (p. 260).

Production. 1,250 copies, printed September 1749 (11 sheets at £1. 12*s*. 6*d*., total £17. 17*s*. 6*d*.).[140]

Publication. Before 10 April 1750. Price 3*s*. bound.[141]

[136] Edinburgh University Library, JA 2996 (Adam Smith's bookplate).
[137] McGill University Library, B1480 1748.
[138] Formerly titled 'Of the Practical Consequences of Natural Religion' in 1748.
[139] In the table of contents of the 1748–56 editions: 'Of the sceptical or academical philosophy'.
[140] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 71.
[141] *General Advertiser*, 10, 17–19 Apr. 1750. Hume says that the long delay in publishing after printing was 'because of the Earthquakes' (Hume to Clephane, 18 Apr. 1750, *Letters*, 1: 141).

1751 (reissue)

Title. PHILOSOPHICAL | ESSAYS | CONCERNING | Human Understanding. | By Mr. HUME, | Author of the Essays Moral and Political. | The SECOND EDITION. | With Additions and Corrections. | (Floral ornament) | *LONDON:* | Printed for M. Cooper, at the *Globe* in | *Paternoster Row*. MDCCLI.

Collation. 12°: $\pi^2(\pm\pi 1)$ A–K^{12} L^{10}; detail as 1750.

Contents. $\pi 1^r$ title as above, verso blank; then $\pi 2$ to L10 as 1750.

Production. 1,000 copies of the cancel title leaf, March 1751 (10*s*. 6*d*.).[142]

Publication. 13 April 1751. Price 3*s*. bound.[143]

1753 (2nd reissue)

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | VOL. II. | CONTAINING | Philosophical Essays concerning | Human Understanding. | The Second Edition, with Additions and | Corrections. | LONDON: | Printed for A. Millar, in the Strand. | M D CC LIII.

Collation. 12°: $\pi^2(\pm\pi 1)$ A–K^{12} L^{10}; detail as 1750.

Contents. $\pi 1^r$ title as above, verso blank; then $\pi 2$ to L10 as 1750.

Variant states. 1. In some copies the 1750 title leaf was not cancelled when the new title leaf was added, so these copies carry two title leaves.[144]

2. In at least one copy the 1753 cancel title coexists with the 1751 cancel title,[145] showing that some of the stock sold by Millar to Cooper in 1751 was bought back by Millar in 1753.

Production. 500 copies of the cancel title leaves for the four volumes reissued under the *ETSS* title, printed April 1753 (12*s*. 6*d*.).[146]

Publication. Around 18 April 1753. Price 12*s*. bound (4 vols.). Volumes were also 'to be had separate to complete Gentlemens Sets'.[147]

[142] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 78.

[143] *General Advertiser*, 13, 16–19 Apr. 1751; *Whitehall Evening-Post*, 13–16, 16–18, 18–20 Apr. 1751; *General Evening-Post*, 13–16, 16–18 Apr. 1751.

[144] e.g. National Library of Scotland, RB. s. 1710.

[145] National Library of Scotland, RB. s. 1723.

[146] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 84.

[147] *Public Advertiser*, 18–21, 23–6 Apr. 1753 (an Advertisement for the four-volume *ETSS* containing this 1753 reissue).

1756 (3rd edition)

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | VOL. II. | CONTAINING | Philosophical Essays concerning | Human Understanding. | The Third Edition, with Additions and | Corrections. | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand. | MDCCLVI.

Collation. 12°: π^2 A–K^{12} L^8 [$6 (–L4–6) signed; $1 (–$\pi$1), Vol. II]; 128 leaves; pp. *i–ii* iii *iv* 1–240 239^2–240^2 241–250 (85, 93 unnumbered in some copies).

Contents. $\pi 1^r$ title as above, verso blank; $\pi 2^r$ CONTENTS, verso blank; A1^r–L6^v text (A9^v, B2^v, D9^v, D12^v, G11^v, I5^v, K6^v blank); ERRATA at foot of L6^v.

Text: *Philosophical Essays*, Essay I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 1–17); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 19–27); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 29–44); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 45–66); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts[148] (pp. 67–89); VI, Of probability (pp. 91–95); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 97–124); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 125–58); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 159–65); X, Of miracles (pp. 167–201); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 203–27); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy[149] (pp. 229–50).

Production. 750 copies, printed September 1755 (11 sheets at £1. 8*s*., total £15. 8*s*.).[150]

Publication. No information. The price remained at 12*s*. bound (4 vols.) throughout the evolution of this edition, and volumes could be purchased individually.[151]

1758

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | BY | DAVID HUME, Esq; | (Rule) | A NEW EDITION. | (Rule) | (Floral ornament) | (Double rule) | LONDON: | Printed for A. Millar, in the Strand; | AND | A. Kincaid and A. Donaldson, at Edinburgh. | (Short rule) | M.DCC.LVIII.

[148] This title contains a misprint ('those' for 'these') on p. 67.

[149] In the table of contents of the 1748–56 editions: 'Of the sceptical or academical philosophy'.

[150] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 94.

[151] *Whitehall Evening-Post*, 12–14, 14–17 Dec. 1754; *London Evening-Post*, 10–12 Feb. 1757; *Public Advertiser*, 19–26 Apr. 1753, 10–16 Dec. 1754.

Collation. 4°: *A*⁴ B–3Y⁴ 3Z² [$2 (–*A*1–2, 3E2, 3Z2) signed; sig. 2R2 misnumbered R2]; 274 leaves; pp. *i–v* vi–viii *1–2* 3–539 *540* (96 misnumbered 6 in some copies, 184 misnumbered 182).

Contents. *A*1ʳ title, verso blank; *A*2ʳ ADVERTISEMENT; *A*2ᵛ bookseller's announcement; *A*3ʳ–*A*4ᵛ THE CONTENTS; B1ʳ half-title, verso blank; B2ʳ–U1ᵛ text; U2ʳ half-title, verso blank; U3ʳ–2N4ᵛ text; 2O1ʳ half-title, verso blank; 2O2ʳ–3E1ᵛ text; 3E2ʳ half-title, verso blank; 3E3ʳ–3Y1ʳ text (3R1ᵛ blank); 3Y1ᵛ blank; 3Y2ʳ–3Z2ʳ INDEX; 3Z2ᵛ ERRATA (15½ lines).

Text: *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary* (pp. 3–280); *EHU*, Sect. I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 283–89); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 289–92); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 292–98); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 298–306); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 306–15); VI, Of probability (pp. 315–16); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 317–27); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 328–40); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 340–43); X, Of miracles (pp. 343–56); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 356–65); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy (pp. 366–75); *DIS* (pp. 376–94); *EPM* (pp. 397–489); *NHR* (pp. 491–529).[152]

Variant issue. An additional sheet (*⁴) was printed in March 1760, to make available to purchasers of the 1758 edition two new essays which Hume was adding to the 1760 edition of *ETSS*. It is paginated to duplicate the numbers 187–9, 265–9, with the impracticable advice that the new pp. 187–9 (*1ʳ–*2ʳ) are to be placed after the existing p. 186, and the new pp. 265–9 (*2ᵛ–*4ᵛ) after p. 264. In copies in which it survives it is more often bound at the end of the *Essays*, after p. 280, between gatherings N and O.

Production. 750 copies, printed October 1757 (68½ sheets at £1. 1*s*., total £71. 18*s*. 6*d*.; index, 9*s*.). 750 copies of the two new essays, printed March 1760 (1 sheet at £1. 1*s*.).[153]

Publication. Around 13–15 April 1758. Price 15*s*. bound.[154]

Note. This edition is the first in which Hume adopted the title *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* in place of the previous title *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding*.

[152] *DIS* and *NHR* appear in *ETSS* for the first time, incorporated from *Four Dissertations* (1757).

[153] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fos. 102, 108.

[154] *Whitehall Evening-Post*, 13–15, 15–18, 20–2, 25–7 Apr., 29 Apr.–4 May 1758, all p. 4 (see earlier announcement, 23–5 Mar. 1758, p. 3); *Public Advertiser*, 13–15, 17–18 Apr. 1758; *London Evening-Post*, 23–5, 28–30 Mar., 8–11 Apr. 1758; *Scots Magazine*, 20 (Apr. 1758), 222; *Edinburgh Magazine*, 2 (May 1758), 84.

1760

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | VOL. III. | Containing an ENQUIRY concerning | HUMAN UNDERSTANDING. | (Rule) | A NEW EDITION. | (Double rule) | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand; | AND | A. KINCAID and A. DONALDSON, at Edinburgh. | MDCCLX.

Collation. 12°: A^2 B–N^{12} O^6 [$6 (–*A*1–2, O4–6) signed; $1 (–*A*1), VOL. III]; 152 leaves; pp. *i–iv 1–2* 3–299 *300*.

Contents. $A1^r$ title as above, verso blank; $A2^{r–v}$ THE CONTENTS OF THE THIRD VOLUME; $B1^r$ half-title, verso blank; $B2^r$–$O6^r$ text ($C2^v$, $C10^v$, $E9^v$, $E12^v$, $H7^v$, Hll^v, $O6^v$ blank).

Text: *EHU*, Sect. I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 3–18); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 19–27); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 29–43); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 45–66); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 67–89); VI, Of probability (pp. 91–95); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 97–124); VIII, Of liberty and necessity[155] (pp. 125–57); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 159–65); X, Of miracles (pp. 167–202); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 203–26); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy (pp. 227–50); *DIS* (pp. 251–99).

Watermarks. Sheets *A* and O show a fleur-de-lys watermark in some copies.[156]

Production. 1,000 copies, printed March 1760 (4 vols., 61 sheets at £1. 10*s*., total £91. 10*s*.).[157]

Publication. Around 19–22 April 1760. Price 12*s*. bound (4 vols.).[158]

1764

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | VOL. II. | CONTAINING | An ENQUIRY concerning HUMAN | UNDERSTANDING. | An ENQUIRY concerning the PRINCIPLES of | MORALS. | AND | The NATURAL HISTORY of

[155] Erroneously given as 'Of liberty and property', running head p. 137.

[156] Bodleian Library, 26782 f. 11 and Vet A5 f. 2618; National Library of Scotland, Hall 133. i.

[157] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 108.

[158] *Whitehall Evening-Post*, 1–3, 5–8, 10–12, 17–19, 19–22, 22–4, 26–9 Apr., 29 Apr.–1 May, 1–3 May 1760; *London Evening-Post*, 22–4, 24–6, 26–9 Apr., 29 Apr.–1 May 1760; *London Chronicle*, 17–19 Apr. 1760, p. 384.

RELIGION. | (Rule) | A NEW EDITION. | (Double rule) | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand; | AND | A. KINCAID and A. DONALDSON, at Edinburgh. | MDCCLXIV.

Collation. 8°: A^4 B–2I^8 2K^4 [$4 (–*A*1–4, 2K3–4) signed; $1 VOL. II]; 256 leaves; pp. *i–viii 1–2* 3–503 *504* (89 unnumbered in some copies, 469 misnumbered 699).

Contents. *A*1^r half-title, verso blank; *A*2^r title as above, verso blank; *A*3^r–*A*4^r THE CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME; *A*4^v blank; B1^r half-title, verso blank; B2^r–P7^r text (C3^v, F1^v, I2^v, I5^v, L2^v blank); P7^v blank; P8^r half-title, verso blank; Q1^r–2I3^r text (Q4^v, R4^v, S8^v, T4^v, U7^v, 2A3^v, 2B1^v, 2B6^v blank); 2I3^v blank; 2I4^r–2K4^r INDEX; 2K4^v blank.

Text: *EHU*, Sect. I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 3–14); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 15–21); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 23–32); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 33–48); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 49–65); VI, Of probability (pp. 67–70); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 71–90); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 91–115); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 117–21); X, Of miracles (pp. 123–47); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 149–66); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy (pp. 167–84); *DIS* (pp. 185–221); *EPM* (pp. 225–414); *NHR* (pp. 415–85).

Production. 1,000 copies, printed May 1764 (2 vols., 68 sheets at £1. 10*s*., total £102; index, 10*s*. 6*d*.).[159]

Publication. 29 May to 4 June 1764. Price 12*s*. bound (2 vols.).[160]

1767

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | VOL. II. | CONTAINING | An ENQUIRY concerning HUMAN | UNDERSTANDING. | An ENQUIRY concerning the PRINCIPLES of | MORALS. | AND | The NATURAL HISTORY of RELIGION. | (Rule) | A NEW EDITION. | (Double rule) | LONDON: | Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand; | AND | A. KINCAID, and A. DONALDSON, at Edinburgh. | M DCC LXVII.

[159] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 128. Although Strahan recorded 68 sheets per copy of this edition of *ETSS*, each of which would generate 8 leaves or 16 pages, the whole work requires the use of only 67 sheets.

[160] *London Chronicle*, 24–6, 29–31 May, 2–5 June 1764; *Edinburgh Advertiser*, 1 (5–8 June 1764); *Public Advertiser*, 30 May, 5–7 June 1764; *London Evening-Post*, 3–5, 26–9, 29–31 May, 2–5 June 1764. A letter from Andrew Millar to Hume of 26 Nov. 1764 (*Letters*, 2: 354) states that the edition was 'published in May'.

Collation. 8°: *A*⁴ B–2I⁸ 2K⁴ [$4 (–*A*1–4, 2K3–4) signed; $1 Vol. II]; 256 leaves; pp. *i–viii 1–2* 3–503 *504*.

Contents. *A*1ʳ half-title, verso blank; *A*2ʳ title as above, verso blank; *A*3ʳ–*A*4ʳ THE CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME; A4ᵛ blank; B1ʳ half-title, verso blank; B2ʳ–P7ʳ text (C3ᵛ, F1ᵛ, I2ᵛ, I5ᵛ, L2ᵛ blank); P7ᵛ blank; P8ʳ half-title, verso blank; Q1ʳ–2I3ʳ text (Q4ᵛ, R4ᵛ, S8ᵛ, T4ᵛ, U7ᵛ, 2A3ᵛ, 2B1ᵛ, 2B6ᵛ blank); 2I3ᵛ blank; 2I4ʳ–2K4ʳ INDEX; 2K4ᵛ blank.

Text: *EHU*, Sect. I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 3–14); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 15–21); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 23–32); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 33–48); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 49–65); VI, Of probability (pp. 67–70); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 71–90); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 91–115); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 117–21); X, Of miracles (pp. 123–47); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 149–66); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy (pp. 167–84); *DIS* (pp. 185–221); *EPM* (pp. 225–414); *NHR* (pp. 415–85).

Variant states. In at least one copy, *A*1 has been folded back behind *A*4.[161]

Watermarks. Sheets *A* and 2K have been found with fleur-de-lys watermark; countermark (initials) not identified.

Production. 1,000 copies, printed September 1766 (2 vols., 67 sheets at £1. 10*s*., total £100. 10*s*.).[162]

Publication. Around January 1767. Price 12*s*. bound (2 vols.).[163]

1768

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq. | VOL. II. | CONTAINING | An ENQUIRY concerning HUMAN | UNDERSTANDING. | An ENQUIRY concerning the PRINCIPLES of | MORALS. | AND | The Natural History of Religion. | (Rule) | A NEW EDITION. | (Double rule) | LONDON: | Printed for A. Millar, | A. Kincaid, J. Bell, and A. Donaldson, in Edinburgh. | And sold by T. Cadell, in the Strand. | M DCC LXVIII.

[161] e.g. Edinburgh University Library, E.B. .1924.

[162] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 137.

[163] A 'New Edition' of *ETSS* is announced together with a new announcement for Hume's *History*, in *London Evening-Post*, 24–7 Jan. 1767, 2; and also 30 Apr.–2 May 1767, 3.

Collation. Royal 4°: A^2 B–3U^4 3X^2 [$2 (–*A*1–2, 3X2) signed; $1 (–*A*1) VOL. II]; 264 leaves; pp. *i–iv 1–2* 3–509 *510–524*.

Contents. *A*1^r title, verso blank; *A*2$^{r–v}$ THE CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME; B1^r half-title, verso blank; B2^r–2G4^r text; 2G4^v blank; 2H1^r half-title, verso blank; 2H2^r–3T2^v text; 3T3^r–3X2^v INDEX.

Text: *EHU*, Sect. I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 3–15); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 16–22); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 23–33); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 34–50); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 51–68); VI, Of probability (pp. 69–72); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 73–94); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 95–120); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 121–26); X, Of miracles (pp. 127–53); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 154–72); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy (pp. 173–91); *DIS* (pp. 192–231); *EPM* (pp. 233–431); *NHR* (pp. 432–508).

Production. 500 copies, printed January 1768 (2 vols., 139½ sheets at 15*s*., total £104. 12*s*. 6*d*.; index 15*s*. 6*d*.).[164]

Publication. No information on date. Price £1. 16*s*. bound (2 vols.).[165]

Other information. In January 1776 Strahan printed 250 copies of an additional leaf to be inserted in the remaining stock of this volume. This leaf carried an early version of the 'Advertisement' that was prefixed to the 1777 edition of *ETSS*, vol. II.[166] No copies of this extra leaf in the 1768 *ETSS* have been discovered.

1770

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | VOL. III. | CONTAINING | An ENQUIRY concerning HUMAN | UNDERSTANDING. | AND | A DISSERTATION on the PASSIONS. | (Rule) | A NEW EDITION. | (Double rule) | LONDON: | Printed for T. CADELL (Successor to Mr. MILLAR) | in the Strand; and | A. KINCAID and A. DONALDSON, at Edinburgh. | (Short rule) | M DCC LXX.

[164] British Library, Add. MS 48800, fo. 138.

[165] Price information from *London Evening-Post*, 27 Feb.–1 Mar. 1770; *General Evening-Post*, 7 Nov. 1771, 30 Mar.–1 Apr. 1773, and 10–13 May 1777; *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, 5 Mar. 1770.

[166] British Library, Add. MS 48801, fo. 68; Hume, *Letters*, 2: 301.

Collation. Sm. 8°: A^2 B–T^8 U^6[$4 (–*A*1–2, U4) signed; $1 (–*A*1), Vol. III]; 152 leaves; pp. *i–iv 1–2* 3–298 *299–300* (152 misnumbered 2 in some copies).

Contents. *A*1^r title, verso blank; *A*2$^{r–v}$ THE CONTENTS OF THE THIRD VOLUME; B1^r half-title, verso blank; B2^r–T5^r text; T5^v blank; T6^r–U5^v NOTES TO THE THIRD VOLUME; U6$^{r–v}$ blank.

Text: *EHU*, Sect. I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 3–19); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 20–27); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 28–41); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 42–62); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 63–83); VI, Of probability (pp. 84–88); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 89–114); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 115–46); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 147–52); X, Of miracles (pp. 153–84); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 185–208); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy (pp. 209–31); *DIS* (pp. 232–281).

Watermarks. Sheets B–P, R: Britannia; countermark GR, crowned. Sheets *A*, Q, S–U: Garden of Holland ('Maid of Dort'); countermark LVG.

Production. 1,000 copies, printed October 1770 (4 vols., 87½ sheets at £1. 3*s*., total £100. 12*s*. 6*d*.; index £1. 1*s*.).[167]

Publication. Between 23 January and 3 July 1771. Price 14*s*. bound (4 vols.).[168]

Other information. In January 1776 Strahan printed 500 copies of an additional leaf to be inserted in the remaining stock of this volume. This leaf carried an early version of the 'Advertisement' that was prefixed to the 1777 edition of *ETSS*, vol. II.[169] The only known copies of this extra leaf in the 1770 *ETSS* have been bound in error into vol. I.[170]

1772

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | VOL. II. | CONTAINING | An ENQUIRY concerning HUMAN | UNDERSTANDING; | A DISSERTATION on the PASSIONS; | An ENQUIRY concerning the PRINCIPLES | of

[167] British Library, Add. MS 48801, fo. 35.

[168] *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, 9 May 1771, 1.

[169] British Library, Add. MS 48801, fo. 68; Hume, *Letters*, 2: 301.

[170] A. Wayne Colver, private copy (cf. Colver, 'A Variant of Hume's Advertisement Repudiating the Treatise'); Liverpool University Library, Fraser 832.

MORALS; | AND | The NATURAL HISTORY of RELIGION. | (Rule) | A NEW EDITION. | (Double rule) | LONDON: | Printed for T. CADELL, in the Strand: and | A. KINCAID, and A. DONALDSON, at Edinburgh. | MDCCLXXII.

Collation. 8°: A^4 B–2L^8 2M^4 [$4 (–*A*1–4, 2M3–4) signed; $1 (–*A*1), VOL. II]; 272 leaves; pp. *i–viii 1–2* 3–533 *534–536*.

Contents. *A*1^r half-title, verso blank; *A*2^r title, verso blank; *A*3^r–*A*4^r THE CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME; *A*4^v blank; B1^r half-title, verso blank; B2^r–P6^v text (B8^v, D1^v, E2^v, I3^v, I6^v, N4^v blank); P7^r half-title, verso blank; P8^r–2H6^r text (Q3^v, R3^v, S6^v, T2^v, X5^v, Z8^v, 2A6^v, 2B2^v, 2B8^v blank); 2H6^v blank; 2H7^r–2L2^r NOTES TO THE SECOND VOLUME; 2L2^v blank; 2L3^r–2M3^r INDEX; 2M3^v blank; 2M4$^{r–v}$ bookseller's announcements.

Text: *EHU*, Sect. I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 3–15); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 17–22); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 23–33); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 35–51); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 53–68); VI, Of probability (pp. 69–72); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 73–92); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 93–117); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 119–23); X, Of miracles (pp. 125–48); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 149–66); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy (pp. 167–83); *DIS* (pp. 185–220); *EPM* (pp. 223–406); *NHR* (pp. 407–75).

Production. 1,000 copies, printed November 1771 (2 vols., 69½ sheets at £1. 10*s*., total £104. 5*s*.).[171]

Publication. No later than May 1772. Price 12*s*. (2 vols.).[172]

Other information. In January 1776 Strahan printed 500 copies of an additional leaf to be inserted in the remaining stock of this volume. This leaf carried an early version of the 'Advertisement' that was prefixed to the 1777 edition of *ETSS*, vol. II.[173] No copies of this leaf of the 1772 *ETSS* have been discovered.

[171] British Library, Add. MS 48801, fo. 52.

[172] 3 June 1772, to Thomas Cadell, *Letters*, 2: 262 (compare 27 Feb. 1772, Strahan to Hume, in *Letters of David Hume to William Strahan*, 244; and 7 Feb. 1772, to Benjamin Franklin, *New Letters*, 194). Price information from *London Chronicle*, 25–7 Feb. 1773; *General Evening-Post*, 30 Mar.–1 Apr. 1773.

[173] British Library, Add. MS 48801, fo. 68; Hume, *Letters*, 2: 301.

1777

Title. ESSAYS | AND | TREATISES | ON | SEVERAL SUBJECTS. | By DAVID HUME, Esq; | VOL. II. | CONTAINING | An ENQUIRY concerning HUMAN | UNDERSTANDING; | A DISSERTATION on the PASSIONS; | An ENQUIRY concerning the PRINCIPLES | of MORALS; | AND | The NATURAL HISTORY of RELIGION. | (Rule) | A NEW EDITION. | (Double rule) | LONDON: | Printed for T. CADELL, in the Strand: and | A. DONALDSON, and W. CREECH, at Edinburgh. | MDCCLXXVII.

Collation. 8°: A^4 B–2L^8 [$4 (–A1, A3–4) signed; $1 (–A1), VOL. II]; 268 leaves; pp. *i–viii 1–2* 3–527 *528* (92 misnumbered 2 in some copies, 191 misnumbered 189, 192 misnumbered 129).

Contents. A1^r title, verso blank; A2^r ADVERTISEMENT, verso blank; A3^r–A4^r THE CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME; A4^v blank; B1^r half-title; verso blank; B2^r–P2^v text (B8^v, C5^v, D6^v, H7^v, I2^v, M8^v blank); P3^r half-title, verso blank; P4^r–2C7^v text (P7^v, Q3^v, R6^v, S2^v, U5^v, Y8^v, Z6^v, 2A6^v, 2B4^v blank); 2C8^r half-title, verso blank; 2D1^r–2H3^r text; 2H3^v blank; 2H4^r–2K7^r NOTES TO THE SECOND VOLUME; 2K7^v blank; 2K8^r–2L8^r INDEX; 2L8^v bookseller's announcement.

Text: *EHU*, Sect. I, Of the different species of philosophy (pp. 3–15); II, Of the origin of ideas (pp. 17–22); III, Of the association of ideas (pp. 23–5); IV, Sceptical doubts concerning the operations of the understanding (pp. 27–43); V, Sceptical solution of these doubts (pp. 45–60); VI, Of probability (pp. 61–4); VII, Of the idea of necessary connexion (pp. 65–84); VIII, Of liberty and necessity (pp. 85–109); IX, Of the reason of animals (pp. 111–15); X, Of miracles (pp. 117–40); XI, Of a particular providence and of a future state (pp. 141–58); XII, Of the academical or sceptical philosophy (pp. 159–75); *DIS* (pp. 177–212); *EPM* (pp. 215–398); *NHR* (pp. 401–69).

Production. 1,000 copies, printed September 1777 (2 vols., 69½ sheets at £1. 10*s*., total £104. 5*s*.).[174]

Publication. January or early February 1778. Price 12*s*. (2 vols.).[175]

Note. This edition published posthumously.

[174] British Library, Add. MS 48815, fo. 8.

[175] Registered, Stationers' Hall, 10 Jan. 1778; advertised, *Public Advertiser*, 5–7 Feb. 1778. See also *Edinburgh Advertiser*, 29 (3–7 Apr. 1778), p. 222.

French Translations in Hume's Lifetime[176]

1758–60. *Œuvres philosophiques de Mr. D. Hume*, 5 volumes (8°). Amsterdam: J. H. Schneider. Only volumes III–IV bear *Œuvres philosophiques de Mr. D. Hume* on the half-title, as this title was added after the publication of volumes I–II. Volume V bears the half-title *Œuvres de Mr. Hume*.

I and II (1758). *Essais philosophiques sur l'entendement humain, par Mr. Hume, avec les quatre philosophes du même auteur*. Traduit de l'anglois par Jean-Bernard Mérian. Préface de Jean-Henri-Samuel Formey. ('Les Quatre philosophes' are essays 6–9 in *Essays, Moral and Political*, volume II of the 1742 edition.)

III (1759). *Histoire naturelle de la religion traduit de l'Anglois de Mr. D. Hume, avec un examen critique & philosophique de cet ouvrage*. Traduit par Jean-Bernard Mérian.

IV (1759). *Dissertations sur les passions, sur la tragédie, sur la règle du goût*. Traduit par Jean-Bernard Mérian.

V (1760). *Essais de morale, ou Recherches sur les principes de la morale*. Traduit par Jean-Baptiste-René Robinet.

In 1758 the first and second volumes were published as a two-volume set. In 1759 the third and fourth volumes were issued separately, but also issued, bound together, as *Œuvres philosophiques de M. D. Hume*, 2 tomes en 1 vol. (8°)—in effect, a translation of *Four Dissertations*.

1761, 1764. *Œuvres de Mr. Hume*, 2^{e} édition (8°). 2 volumes only. Amsterdam: J. H. Schneider. Each volume has a special title-page.

I (1764). *Essais moraux et politiques*. 2^{e} éd.

II (1761). *Essais philosophiques sur l'entendement humain*. 2^{e} éd.

These volumes were sometimes bound with volumes 3–5 of the 1759–60 editions, as a five-volume set; but only the above titles are specified 2^{e} édition.

1764. *Œuvres philosophiques de M. D. Hume*. Nouvelle édition. 6 volumes (8°). London: David Wilson.

I. Les huits premiers Essais sur l'entendement humain.

II. Les quatre derniers Essais sur l'entendement humain [continued] et les quatre philosophes.

III. L'histoire naturelle de la religion.

[176] Some historical and bibliographical detail on early French translations is provided in Chuo University, *David Hume and the Eighteenth Century British Thought*; Jessop, *A Bibliography of David Hume and of Scottish Philosophy*, 10–11; and *Letters of David Hume*, vol. 2, app. B. Jessop did not have entirely correct information. Archaic French has been retained below.

IV. Les dissertations sur les passions, sur la tragédie et sur la règle du goût.
V. Les recherches sur les principes de la morale (with 'A Dialogue').
VI. Les essais moraux & politiques.

New printing of 1758–61 editions of *Œuvres philosophiques*.

1767. *Pensées philosophiques, morales, critiques, littéraires et politiques de M. Hume*. London . . . Paris: Veuve Duchesne (12°). Selections extracted from Hume's works, translated by Jean-Auguste Jullien (De Boulmiers). The first five sections of the first part contain selections from *EHU* 1–5, 8, and 12, without using this title.

Other translations in French bear little or no connection to *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*. The first of Hume's works to appear in French was his *Political Discourses*: *Discours politiques de Monsieur David Hume* (Amsterdam: 1754). The last work published in Hume's lifetime was *Le Génie de M. Hume* (London . . . Paris, 1770), which contains excerpts from Hume's *Essays* and *History of England*, with altered titles.

German Translations in Hume's Lifetime

1754–6. Herrn David Hume, Esq. *Vermischte Schriften*. 4 volumes, unnumbered. Hamburg and Leipzig, G. Ch. Grund und A. H. Holle.

1754. *Über die Handlung, die Manufacturen und die andern Quellen des Reichtums und der Macht eines Staates*. Translation of *Political Discourses* by Hermann Andreas Pistorius, with Vorbericht.
1755. *Philosophische Versuche über die menschliche Erkenntnis von David Hume, Ritter. Als dessen vermischter Schriften zweyter Theil*. Translation of *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding* by Johann Georg Sulzer, with Vorrede.
1756. *Sittenlehre der Gesellschaft. Als dessen vermischter Schriften dritter Theil*. Translation of *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*.
1756. *Moralische und politische Versuche. Als dessen vermischter Schriften vierter und letzter Theil*. Translation of *Essays, Moral and Political*.

Other translations in German bear little or no connection to *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*. These publications include:

1759. *Vier Abhandlungen: 1. Die natürliche Geschichte der Religion; 2. Von den Leidenschaften; 3. Vom Trauerspiel; 4. Von der Grundregel des Geschmacks. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt*. Quedlingsburg and Leipzig: Biesterfeld. Translation of *Four Dissertations*.

1774. *Das Genie des Hrn. Hume. Oder: Sammlung der vorzüglichsten Grundsätze dieses Philosophen*. Edited and translated by Johann Gottfried Bremer. Leipzig. Apparently translated from the French volume of the same title.

5. THE REMAINS OF THE *TREATISE*, *ABSTRACT*, AND *LETTER*

After Hume's consolidation of his writings in the collected editions of the 1750s, his table of contents showed a notable schematic resemblance to the titles of the three books of the *Treatise*. The major division of the *Treatise* and the titles of the first three treatises in (the second half of) *Essays and Treatises* are virtually identical when introductory words such as 'Book', 'Enquiry', and 'Dissertation' are omitted. (See Table 3.)

TABLE 3. *Comparison of titles*

In *THN*	In *Essays and Treatises (second half)*
Of the *Understanding*	. . . concerning Human *Understanding*
Of the *Passions*	. . . on the *Passions*
Of *Morals*	. . . concerning . . . *Morals*

From this perspective, the major divisions and the arranged order were essentially identical in the *Treatise* and the treatises portion of the 1758–77 *Essays and Treatises*.[177]

Some of Hume's commentators have suggested that there is a very strong connection between the *Treatise* and the works in *Essays and Treatises*, including *EHU*. They maintain that when drafting *EHU*, Hume incorporated not only the *ideas* but the *exact language* of the *Treatise*, to the extent that it still met with his approval.[178] It has long been known that this thesis is

[177] *DIS* and *NHR* first appeared in 1757, after *EHU* and *EPM* were bound together in the 1753–6 edition(s) of *ETSS*. The two 1757 works may have been added to the *Treatises* side of the arrangement (rather than to the *Essays* side) because of their length and because of a need to equalize the size of Part 1 and Part 2 of *ETSS*.

[178] A typical example of this commentary is James Noxon's estimate: 'Hume did not overtax himself in rewriting his theory of natural belief for the first *Enquiry*. He simply culled passages from Sections 7 and 8 of Book I, Part iii of the *Treatise*, and from the Appendix, and rearranged them. Some he rephrased; others are set down verbatim. Apart from lines inserted to stitch this patchwork together, no new material of any interest shows up until the last two paragraphs of Section V, Part ii' (*Hume's Philosophical Development*, 157).

correct about *A Dissertation on the Passions*, but the evidence pertaining to *EHU* has never been assembled. However, computer collation now enables precise comparison. The collation of *THN* and *EHU* below casts suspicion on the hypothesis of a major carry-over of the language of the *Treatise*. Only a few passages of more than one sentence are retained in the exact language of *THN*, and virtually all parts of *EHU* are the products of fresh writing.

EHU carries over several sentence fragments, sentences, and paragraphs from *Treatise* 1 and 2, the *Abstract*, and the *Letter from a Gentleman*. These sentences—the preserved remnants of these three works—appear in Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 12 of *EHU*. Sections 5 and 8 are the only sections that borrow a significant percentage of sentences from the early works; and the sentences borrowed comprise but a small percentage of each section (or designated 'part' of a section). This comparison confirms that Hume transcribed passages verbatim from the earlier works, but only fourteen paragraphs constitute nearly verbatim transcriptions.

All variations are shown below by strike-out and shading within each shared passage. Deletions from the *Treatise*, the *Abstract*, and *A Letter from a Gentleman* appear in strike-out mode; additions in *EHU* appear as shaded text of the 1748 edition; italics are represented by '/' for the beginning and '\' for the end. Text that is common to both works is free of both strike-out and shading. The order of the passages follows the page order in the 1748 edition. In this comparison initial capitals in the 1748 edition have been converted to lower-case forms (as they appeared in all editions after 1750). Contractions and purely typographical conventions such as full capitalization and italics in section titles have occasionally been modified to make comparison maximally intelligible. These modifications of the 1748 edition are sanctioned by Hume's own changes in one or more later editions.

1. *THN* 1.1.1.1 and note—*EHU* 2.title and 2.3 (1748: 22–23)

Of the Origin of ~~our~~ Ideas. . . .

HERE therefore we may divide a~~A~~ll the perceptions of the ~~human~~ mind ~~resolve themselves~~ into two ~~distinct kinds,~~ classes or species, which ~~I shall call /impressions\ and /ideas\. The difference betwixt these consists in the~~ are distinguish'd by their different degrees of force and ~~liveliness, with which they strike upon the mind, and make their way into our thought or consciousness. . . . But notwithstanding this near resemblance in a few instances, they are in general so very different, that no one can make a scruple~~ vivacity. The less forcible and lively are commonly denominated THOUGHTS or IDEAS. The other species want a name in our language, and in most others; I suppose, because it was not requisite for any, but philosophical purposes, to

rank them under ~~distinct heads, and assign to each a peculiar name to mark the difference. <Note begins>. . . . I here make use of these terms, /impression and idea\,~~ a general term or appellation. Let us, therefore, use a little freedom, and call them IMPRESSIONS, employing that word in a sense somewhat different from the ~~what is~~ usual~~, and I hope this liberty will be allowed me. Perhaps I rather restore the word, idea, to its original sense, from which Mr. /Locke\ had perverted it, in making it stand for all our perceptions~~. By the term ~~of~~ /impressions\, ~~I would not be understood to express the manner, in which our~~ then, we mean all our more lively perceptions, ~~are produced in the soul, but merely the perceptions themselves; for which there is no particular name either in the /English\ or any other language, that I know of. <Note ends>~~ when we hear, or see, or feel, or love, or hate, or desire, or will.

2. *THN* 1.1.1.10—*EHU* 2.8 (1748: 26–27)

There is, however, one contradictory phaenomenon, which may prove, that 'tis not absolutely impossible for ideas to go before their correspondent impressions. I believe it will readily be allow'd, that the several distinct ideas of colours, which enter by the eyes, or those of sounds, which are convey'd by the hearing, are really different from each other~~;~~, tho', at the same time, resembling. Now if this be true of different colours, it must be no less so, of the different shades of the same colour~~, that~~; and each ~~of them~~ shade produces a distinct idea, independent of the rest. For if this should be deny'd, 'tis possible, by the continual gradation of shades, to run a colour insensibly into what is most remote from it; and if you will not allow any of the means to be different, you cannot, without absurdity, deny the extremes to be the same. Suppose, therefore, a person to have enjoyed his sight for thirty years, and to have become perfectly well acquainted with colours of all kinds, excepting one particular shade of blue, for instance, which it never has been his fortune to meet with. Let all the different shades of that colour, except that single one, be plac'd before him, descending gradually from the deepest to the lightest; 'tis plain, that he will perceive a blank, where that shade is wanting, and will be sensible, that there is a greater distance in that place betwixt the contiguous colours~~,~~ than in any other. Now I ask, whether 'tis possible for him, from his own imagination, to supply this deficiency, and raise up to himself the idea of that particular shade, tho' it had never been conveyed to him by his senses? I believe there are few but will be of opinion that he can; and this may serve as a proof, that the simple ideas are not always, in every instance, derived from the correspondent impressions; tho' ~~the~~ this instance is so particular and singular, that 'tis scarce worth our observing, and does not merit, that for it alone we should alter our general maxim.

3. *THN* 1.1.4.1–2—*EHU* 3.2–3 (1748: 32)

Of the connexion ~~or association~~ of ideas. . . .

~~The qualities, from which this association arises, and by which the mind is after this manner convey'd are~~ To me, there appear to be only three principles of connexion among ideas, /viz. Resemblance, Contiguity\ in time or place, and /Cause\ or /Effect\. That these principles serve to connect ideas will not, I believe, ~~it will not be very necessary to prove, that these qualities produce an association among ideas, . . .~~ be much doubted. A picture naturally leads our thoughts to the original . . .[179]

4. *Abstract* 18—*EHU* 4.2 (1748: 48)

Were it ~~What is~~ demonstratively false it would imply ~~implies~~ a contradiction~~;~~, and ~~what implies a contradiction cannot~~ could never be distinctly conceived by the mind.

5. *Abstract* 8—*EHU* 4.4 (1748: 49)

~~'Tis evident, that a~~All reasonings concerning ~~/~~matter of fact~~\ are~~ seem to be founded on the relation of /cause\ and /effect\.~~, and that we can never infer the existence of one object from another, unless they be connected together, . . .~~ And here 'tis constantly suppos'd, that there is a Connexion betwixt the present Fact and that infer'd from it.

6. *THN* 1.4.4.1—*EHU* 4.4 (1748: 49–50)

~~One who concludes somebody to be near him, when he hears~~ The hearing of an articulate voice and rational discourse in the dark~~, reasons justly and naturally~~ assures us of the presence of some person:~~; tho' that conclusion be deriv'd from nothing but custom,~~ Why? Because these are the effects of the human make and fabric. . . .

7. *Abstract* 8—*EHU* 4.14 (1748: 57)

~~'Tis evident, that~~ When it is ask'd, /What is the nature of all our reasonings concerning ~~/~~matter of fact\? the proper answer seems to be, that they are founded on the relation of cause and effect. . . .

8. *THN* 1.3.6.5 —*EHU* 4.18 (1748: 61–62)

~~Our foregoing method of reasoning will easily convince us,~~ T~~t~~hat there ~~can be~~ are no ~~/~~demonstrative~~\~~ arguments ~~to prove, /that those instances, of~~

[179] The expression 'picture naturally' (to make the same point about resemblance) occurs at *Abstract* 35 (and see also the use of 'picture of an absent friend' in the comparison 12 immediately below). Hume mentions the three principles at *THN* 1.2.5.20, 1.3.6.13, 1.4.6.7, 2.2.4.10, 2.1.4.3, 2.1.11.4, 2.1.11.8, 2.1.12.7.

~~which we have had no experience, resemble those, of which we have had experience\. We can at least conceive a change in~~ the case, seems evident; since it implies no contradiction, that the course of nature~~; which sufficiently proves, that such a change is not absolutely impossible.~~ may change, and that objects seemingly like those we have experienc'd may be attended with different or contrary Effects.

9. *Abstract* 14—*EHU* 4.21 (1748: 65–66)

~~[H]e could not so much as prove by~~ 'Tis impossible, therefore, that any ~~/probable\~~ arguments~~, that the future must be conformable~~ from experience can prove this resemblance of the past to the future; since ~~past. A~~all these ~~probable~~ arguments are ~~built~~ founded on the supposition~~, that there is this conformity betwixt the future and the past,~~ of that resemblance. ~~and therefore can never prove it. This conformity is a /matter of fact\, and if it must be proved, will admit of no proof but from experience. But our experience in the past can be a proof of nothing~~ Let the course of things be allow'd hitherto never so regular; that alone, without some new argument or inference, proves not, that, for the future, ~~but upon a supposition, that there is a resemblance betwixt them.~~ it will continue so.

10. *THN* 1.3.4.2–1 (reversed in order)—*EHU* 5.7 (1748: 77–78)

~~[T]hese ideas were either in the minds of such as were immediately present at that action, and receiv'd the ideas directly from its existence; or they were deriv'd from the~~ We learn the events of former ages from history; but then we must peruse the volumes, in which this instruction is contain'd, and thence carry up our inferences from one testimony ~~of others, and that again from~~ to another ~~testimony, by a visible gradation,~~' till we arrive at ~~those who were~~ the eye-witnesses and spectators of these distant ~~the~~ events. In a word, if we proceed not upon some fact, present to our ~~'Tis obvious all this chain of argument or connexion of causes and effects, is at first founded on those characters or letters, which are seen or remember'd, and that without the authority either of the~~ memory or senses, our ~~whole~~ reasonings would be merely hypothetical; ~~chimerical and without foundation.~~ and however the particular ~~Every~~ links might be connected with each other, ~~of~~ the whole chain of Inferences would ~~in that case hang upon another;~~ have nothing to support it, nor could we ever . . . arrive at ~~there being in them, neither any present impression, nor belief~~ the knowledge of ~~a~~ any real existence. . . . But as you cannot proceed after this Manner, ~~'Tis impossible for us to carry on our inferences~~ /in infinitum\~~; and the only thing, that can stop them, is an impression of the~~, you must at last terminate in some fact, which is present to

your memory or senses~~, beyond which there is no room for doubt or enquiry~~; or must allow, that your Belief is entirely without Foundation.

11. *THN* 1.3.7.7 and Appendix 4—*EHU* 5.12 (1748: 82–83)

This variety of terms, which may seem so unphilosophical, is intended only to express that act of the mind, which renders realities, or what is taken for such, more present to us than fictions, causes them to weigh more in the thought, and gives them a superior influence on the passions and imagination. Provided we agree about the thing, 'tis needless to dispute about the terms. The imagination has the command over all its ideas, and can join~~,~~ and mix~~,~~ and vary them, in all the ways possible. It may conceive fictitious objects with all the circumstances of place and time. It may set them, in a manner, before our eyes, in their true colours, just as they might have existed. But as it is impossible, that that faculty of imagination can ever, of itself, reach belief~~,~~; 'tis evident, that belief consists not in the peculiar nature ~~and~~ or order of ~~our~~ ideas, but in the /manner\ of their conception, and in their /feeling\ to the mind. I confess, that 'tis impossible perfectly to explain ~~perfectly~~ this feeling or manner of conception. We may make use of words, that express something near it. But its true and proper name, as we observ'd before, is /belief\~~,~~; which is a term, that every one sufficiently understands in common life. And in philosophy, we can go no farther~~,~~ than assert, that ~~it~~ /belief\ is something ~~/~~felt~~\~~ by the mind, which distinguishes the ideas of the judgment from the fictions of the imagination. It gives them more force and influence; makes them appear of greater importance; ~~infixes~~ inforces them in the mind~~;~~, and renders them the governing principle~~s~~ of all our actions. ~~. . . For instance;~~ I hear at present, for instance, a person's voice, whom I am acquainted with; and this sound comes as from the next room. This impression of my senses immediately conveys my thoughts to the person, along with all the surrounding objects. I paint them out to myself as ~~existent~~ existing at present, with the same qualities and relations, that I formerly knew them possess'd of. These ideas take faster hold of my mind, than ~~the~~ ideas of an inchanted castle. They are very different to the feeling~~,; but there is no distinct or separate impression attending them~~ and have a much greater Influence of every Kind, either to give Pleasure or Pain, Joy or Sorrow.

12. *THN* 1.3.8.3–6 and Appendix '*note to* Book 1'—*EHU* 5.15–17 and note 9 (1748: 85–88 and note)

We may, therefore, observe, as the first experiment to our present purpose, that upon the appearance of the picture of an absent friend, our idea of him is evidently ~~i~~enliven'd by the /resemblance\, and that every passion, which

that idea occasions, whether of joy or sorrow, acquires new force and vigour. In producing this effect, there concur both a relation and a present impression. Where the picture bears him no resemblance, or at least was not intended for him, it never so much as conveys our thought to him: And where it is absent, as well as the person; tho' the mind may pass from the thought of the one to that of the other; it feels its idea to be rather weaken'd than ~~i~~enliven'd by that transition. We take a pleasure in viewing the picture of a friend, when 'tis set before us; but when 'tis remov'd, rather choose to consider him directly, than by reflexion in an image, which is equally distant and obscure.

The ceremonies of the /Roman Catholic\ religion may be consider'd as experiments of the same nature. The devotees of that strange superstition usually plead in excuse of the mummeries, with which they are upbraided, that they feel the good effect of those external motions, and postures, and actions, in ~~i~~enlivening their devotion~~,~~ and quickening their fervour, which otherwise would decay away, if directed entirely to distant and immaterial objects. We shadow out the objects of our faith, say they, in sensible types and images, and render them more present to us by the immediate presence of these types, than 'tis possible for us to do, merely by an intellectual view and contemplation. Sensible objects have always a greater influence on the fancy than any other; and this influence they readily convey to those ideas, to which they are related, and which they resemble. I shall only infer from these practices, and this reasoning, that the effect of resemblance in ~~i~~enlivening the idea is very common; and as in every case a resemblance and a present impression must concur, we are abundantly supply'd with experiments to prove the reality of the foregoing principle.

We may add force to these experiments by others of a different kind, in considering the effects of /contiguity\~~,~~ as well as of /resemblance\. 'Tis certain~~,~~ that distance diminishes the force of every idea, and that upon our approach to any object; tho' it does not discover itself to our senses; it operates upon the mind with an influence, that imitates an immediate impression. The thinking on any object readily transports the mind to what is contiguous; but 'tis only the actual presence of an object, that transports it with a superior vivacity. When I am a few miles from home, whatever relates to it touches me more nearly than when I am two hundred leagues distant; tho' even at that distance the reflecting on any thing in the neighbourhood of my friends ~~and~~ or family naturally produces an idea of them. But as in this latter case, both the objects of the mind are ideas; notwithstanding there is an easy transition betwixt them; that transition alone is not able to give a superior vivacity to any of the ideas, for want of some immediate impression.

<The following Latin quotation appears as a note in both works—a

footnote at this point in *EHU* and an added note in the Appendix of *THN*, to be inserted at this point.>. Naturane nobis, inquit, datum dicam, an errore quodam, ut, cum ea loca videamus, in quibus memoria dignos viros acceperimus multum esse versatos, magis moveamur, quam siquando eorum ipsorum aut facta audiamus, aut scriptum aliquod legamus? Velut ego nunc moveor. Venit enim mihi Platonis in mentem~~:~~, quem acc~~i~~epimus primum hic disputare solitum: Cujus etiam illi hortuli propinqui non memoriam solum mihi afferunt, sed ipsum videntur in conspectu meo hic ponere. Hic Speusippus, hic Xenocrates, hic ejus auditor Polemo; cujus ipsa illa sessio fuit, quam videamus. Equidem etiam curiam nostram, hostiliam dico, non hanc novam, quae mihi minor esse videtur postquam est major, solebam intuens, Scipionem, Catonem, Laelium, nostrum vero in primis avum cogitare. Tanta vis admonitionis ~~in~~est in locis; ut non sine causa ex his memoriae deducta sit disciplina. Cicero de Finibus~~,~~. Lib. 5.

<The text continues without interruption at this point.> No one can doubt but causation has the same influence as the other two relations of resemblance and contiguity. Superstitious people are fond of the relicts of saints and holy men, for the same reason, that they seek after types and images, in order to ~~i~~enliven their devotion, and give them a more intimate and strong conception of those exemplary lives, which they desire to imitate. Now 'tis evident~~,~~ one of the best relicts a devotee could procure~~,~~ would be the handywork of a saint; and if his cloaths and furniture are ever to be consider'd in this light, 'tis because they were once at his disposal, and were mov'd and affected by him; in which respect they are to be consider'd as imperfect effects, and as connected with him by a shorter chain of consequences than any of those, ~~from~~ by which we learn the reality of his existence.

13. *THN* 1.3.11.2, 6, 12 (and title)—*EHU* 6.title, 6.2, and note 10 (1748: 93–94)

Of ~~/the~~ probability ~~of chances\~~<Note 10:>

~~. . . to distinguish human reason into three kinds, viz.~~ . . . to conform our language more to common use, we should divide arguments into~~ /that from knowledge, from~~ /demonstrations\, /proofs\, and~~ from~~ /probabilities\. ~~. . .~~ By proofs~~,~~ ~~those~~ meaning such arguments~~, which are deriv'd~~ from experience as leave no room for ~~the relation of cause and effect, and which are entirely free from~~ doubt~~ and uncertainty.~~ or opposition. . . . If a ~~A~~ dye~~,~~ ~~that has four sides~~ were mark'd with ~~a certain~~ one figure or number of spots on four sides, and ~~only two~~ with another~~, affords us an obvious and easy instance of this superiority.~~ figure or number of spots on the two remaining sides, 'twould be more probable, that the former should turn up than the latter; . . .

It seems evident, that when the mind looks forward to discover the event, which may result from the throw of such a ~~'Tis suppos'd, that tho' the~~ dye, ~~be necessarily determin'd to fall, and~~ it considers the turning up ~~one~~ of each ~~of its sides, yet there is nothing to fix the~~ particular side~~, but that this is determin'd entirely by chance.~~ as alike probable; and this is ~~T~~the very nature ~~and essence~~ of chance ~~is a negation of causes, . . . the chances present all these sides as~~ to render all the particular events, comprehended in it, entirely equal~~, and make us consider every one of them, one after another, as alike probable and possible~~.

14. *THN* 1.3.14.5 —*EHU* 7.8 note 12 (1748: 105 and note)

~~See~~ Mr. /Locke\~~;~~, in his chapter of power~~. . . . [He says] . . .~~ says, that finding from experience, that there are several new productions in matter, . . . and concluding that there must somewhere be a power, capable of producing them, we arrive at last by this reasoning at the idea of power ~~and efficacy~~.

15. *A Letter from a Gentleman* 32—*EHU* 7.25 and note 16 (1748: note and one sentence from pages 114–115 set in the middle of the note for purposes of comparison)

~~No one, till~~ /Des Cartes\ insinuated that doctrine of the universal and sole efficacy of the Deity, without insisting on it. /Malebranche\~~, ever entertained an opinion that matter had no Force either /primary\ or /secondary\, and /independent\ or /concurrent\, and could not so much as properly be called an /Instrument\ in the Hands of the Deity, to serve any of the Purposes of Providence. These Philosophers last-mentioned substituted the Notion of /occasional~~ and other /Cartesians\ made it the foundation of all their philosophy. . . . /Causes\, ~~by which it was asserted that a~~ are in Reality nothing but /Occasions\; . . . Instead of saying, that one Billiard-Ball ~~did not~~ moves another ~~by its impulse, but was only the occasion why,~~ by a force, which it has deriv'd from the Author of Nature; 'tis the Deity~~, in pursuance of~~ himself, they say, who, by a particular Volition, moves the second ball, being determin'd to this Operation by the Impulse of the first ball; in consequence of those general laws, which he has laid down to himself in the government of the universe. . . . ~~bestowed Motion on the second Ball. But, tho' this opinion be very innocent, it never gained great Credit, especially~~ It had, however, no authority in /England\~~, where it was considered as too much contrary to received popular opinions, and too little supported by philosophical arguments, ever to be admitted as any thing but a /mere hypothesis. Cudworth, /~~Locke\, ~~and~~ /Clarke\. . . . , and /Cudworth\~~;~~

~~make little or no mention~~ never so much as take notice of it. . . . It was never the meaning of Sir /Isaac Newton\ ~~(tho' some of his followers have taken a different Turn of thinking) plainly rejects it. . . .~~ to rob matter of all force or energy; . . . he was so cautious and modest as to allow, that it was a mere Hypothesis, not to be insisted on, without more experiments.

16. *THN* 1.3.14.35—*EHU* 7.29 (1748: 124) [See also *A Letter from a Gentleman* 7]

~~If we~~ Suitable to this experience, therefore, we may define a cause to be~~,~~ /an object ~~precedent and contiguous to~~, follow'd by another, and where all the objects ~~resembling the former are plac'd in a like relation of priority and contiguity to those~~, similar to the first, are follow'd by objects, similar to the second\. ~~that resemble the latter\. . . .~~ The appearance of a cause does always convey the mind, by a customary transition, to the idea of the effect. Of this also we have experience. We may, therefore, suitable to this experience, form another definition of ~~If we define a~~ cause, and call it ~~to be~~, /an object ~~precedent and contiguous to~~, follow'd by another, and whose appearance always conveys the thought to that ~~so united with it in the imagination, that the idea of the one determines the mind to form the idea of the~~ other\.~~, and the impression of the one to form a more lively idea of the other\. . . .~~

17. *THN* 2.3.1.2—*EHU* 8.2 (1748: 130)

~~[We] shall examine that~~ This has been the case in the long-disputed question concerning ~~/~~liberty and necessity~~\; which occurs so naturally in treating of the will~~.

18. *THN* 2.3.1.10—*EHU* 8.8 (1748: 135)

Should a traveller, returning from a far country, bring ~~tell~~ us~~, that he had seen a climate~~ an account of men . . .

19. *THN* 1.3.12.5—*EHU* 8.13 (1748: 139–140)

The vulgar, who take things according to their first appearance, attribute the uncertainty of events to such an uncertainty in the causes~~,~~ as makes them often fail of their usual influence~~,~~; tho' they meet with no obstacle nor impediment in their operation. But philosophers, observing, that almost in every part of nature there is contain'd a vast variety of springs and principles, which are hid, by reason of their minuteness or remoteness, find, that 'tis at least possible the contrariety of events may not proceed from any

contingency in the cause, but from the secret operation of contrary causes. This possibility is converted into certainty by farther observation, when they remark, that, upon an exact scrutiny, a contrariety of effects always betrays a contrariety of causes, and proceeds from their mutual hindrance and opposition. A peasant can give no better reason for the stopping of any clock or watch than to say~~, that~~ it commonly ~~it~~ does not go right: But an artizan easily perceives, that the same force in the spring or pendulum has always the same influence on the wheels; but fails of its usual effect, perhaps by reason of a grain of dust, which puts a stop to the whole movement. From the observation of several parallel instances, philosophers form a maxim, that the connexion betwixt all causes and effects is equally necessary, and that its seeming uncertainty in some instances proceeds from the secret opposition of contrary causes.

20. *THN* 2.3.1.17—*EHU* 8.19 (1748: 144–145)

And indeed, when we consider how aptly /natural\ and /moral\ evidence ~~cement~~ link together, and form only one chain of argument betwixt them, we shall make no scruple to allow, that they are of the same nature, and deriv'd from the same principles. A prisoner, who has neither money nor interest, discovers the impossibility of his escape, as well from the obstinacy of the gaoler, as from the walls and bars, with which he is surrounded; and in all attempts for his freedom chooses, rather to work upon the stone and iron of the one, than upon the inflexible nature of the other. The same prisoner, when conducted to the scaffold, foresees his death as certainly from the constancy and fidelity of his guards as from the operation of the ax or wheel. His mind runs along a certain train of ideas: The refusal of the soldiers to consent to his escape~~,~~; the action of the executioner; the separation of the head and body; bleeding, convulsive motions, and death. Here is a connected chain of natural causes and voluntary actions; but the mind feels no difference betwixt them, in passing from one link to another~~,~~: nor is less certain of the future event than if it were connected with the objects present ~~impressions of~~ to the memory ~~and~~ or senses, by a train of causes, cemented together by what we are pleas'd to call a /physical\ necessity~~\~~. The same experienc'd union has the same effect on the mind, whether the united objects be motives, volitions, and actions; or figure and motion. We may change the names of things; but their nature and their operation on the understanding never change.

21. *THN* 2.3.2.2—*EHU* 8.22 note 18 (1748: 148 note)

~~/Secondly\, There is a /false sensation\ or /experience\ even~~ The prevalence of the doctrine of liberty ~~of indifference; which is regarded as an~~

~~argument for its real existence.~~ may be accounted for, from another cause, /viz\. a false sensation or seeming experience which we have, or may have of liberty or indifference, in many of our actions. The necessity of any action, whether of matter or of ~~the~~ mind, is not, properly speaking, a quality in the agent, but in any thinking or intelligent being, who may consider the action~~,~~; and it consists chiefly in the determination of his thought to infer ~~its~~ the existence of that action from some preceding objects~~:~~, as liberty ~~or chance, on the other hand~~, when oppos'd to necessity, is nothing but the want of that determination, and a certain looseness or indifference, which we feel, in passing or not passing, from the idea of one object to that of ~~the other~~ any succeeding one. Now we may observe, that, tho' in /reflecting\ on human actions we seldom feel such a looseness or indifference, ~~yet it very~~ but are commonly able to infer them with considerable certainty from their motives, and from the dispositions of the agent; yet it frequently happens, that, in /performing\ the actions themselves, we are sensible of something like it: And as all ~~related or~~ resembling objects are readily taken for each other, this has been employ'd as a demonstrative ~~or~~ and even an intuitive proof of human liberty. We feel, that our actions are subject to our will, on most occasions~~,~~; and imagine we feel, that the will itself is subject to nothing~~;~~, because, when by a denial of it we are provok'd to try, we feel that it moves easily every way, and produces an image of itself, (or a /velleity\, as it is call'd in the schools) even on that side, on which it did not settle. This image, or faint motion, we persuade ourselves, could, at that time, have been compleated into the thing itself; because, should that be deny'd, we find, upon a second trial, that, at present, it can. ~~But these efforts are all in vain; and whatever capricious and irregular actions we may perform; as the~~ We consider not, that the fantastical desire of showing ~~our~~ liberty is here the ~~sole~~ motive of our actions.~~; we can never free ourselves from the bonds of necessity.~~ And it seems certain, that however we ~~We~~ may imagine we feel a liberty within ourselves~~; but~~, a spectator can commonly infer our actions from our motives and character; and even where he cannot, he concludes in general, that he might, were he perfectly acquainted with every circumstance of our situation and temper, and the most secret springs of our complexion and disposition. Now this is the very essence of necessity, according to the foregoing doctrine.

22. *THN* 2.3.2.3–7—*EHU* 8.26–30 (1748: 152–156)

There is no method of reasoning more common, and yet none more blameable, than in philosophical debates, to endeavour ~~to refute~~ the refutation of any hypothesis, by a pretext of its dangerous consequences to religion and morality. When any opinion leads ~~us~~ into absurdities, 'tis certainly false;

but 'tis not certain an opinion is false, because 'tis of dangerous consequence. Such topics, therefore, ought entirely to be forborn, as serving nothing to the discovery of truth, but only to make the person of an antagonist odious. This I observe in general, without pretending to draw any advantage from it. I submit ~~myself~~ frankly to an examination of this kind, and ~~dare~~ shall venture to affirm, that the doctrines, both of necessity and liberty, ~~according to my explication of it~~ as above explain'd, ~~is~~ are not only consistent with ~~innocent, but even advantageous to religion and~~ morality and religion, but are absolutely essential to them. And first, of necessity.

~~I define~~ Necessity may be defin'd two ways, conformable to the two definitions of /cause\, of which it makes an essential part. ~~I place it~~ It consists either in the constant union and conjunction of like objects, or in the inference of the ~~mind~~ understanding from ~~the~~ one object to ~~the other~~ another. Now necessity, in both these senses, (which, indeed, are, at the bottom, the same) has universally, tho' tacitly, in the schools, in the pulpit, and in common life, been allow'd to belong to the will of man~~,~~; and no one has ever pretended to deny, that we can draw inferences concerning human actions, and that those inferences are founded on the experienc'd union of like actions, with like motives, inclinations, and circumstances. The only particular, in which any one can differ ~~from me~~, is, that either, ~~that~~ perhaps, he will refuse to ~~call this~~ give the name of necessity~~.~~ to this property of human actions: But as long as the meaning is understood, I hope the word can do no harm~~.~~: Or that he will maintain ~~there is~~ it possible to discover something ~~else~~ farther in the operations of matter. ~~Now whether it be so or not is~~ But this, it must be acknowledg'd, can be of no consequence to morality or religion, whatever it may be to natural philosophy or metaphysics. ~~I~~ We may be mistaken in asserting, that ~~we have~~ there is no idea of any other necessity or connexion in the actions of body~~, and shall be glad to be farther instructed on that head: But sure I am, I~~. But surely we here ascribe nothing to the actions of the mind, but what every one does, and must readily ~~be~~ allow~~'d~~ of.~~. . . . I~~ We change~~, therefore, nothing~~ no circumstance in the receiv'd orthodox system~~s~~, with regard to the will, but only in that with regard to material objects and causes.~~. . . 'Tis indeed certain, that as~~ Nothing therefore can be more innocent, at least, than this doctrine. A~~a~~ll ~~human~~ laws ~~are~~ being founded on rewards and punishments, 'tis suppos'd as a fundamental principle, that these motives have ~~an~~ a regular and uniform influence on the mind, and both produce the good and prevent the evil actions. We may give to this influence, what name we please; but as 'tis usually conjoin'd with the action, ~~common sense requires~~ it ~~shou'd~~ must be esteem'd a /cause\, and be look'd upon as an instance of that necessity, which ~~I~~ we would establish.

~~. . . .~~ The ~~constant and universal~~ only proper object of hatred or ~~anger~~ vengeance, is a person, or creature, endow'd with thought and consciousness; and when any criminal or injurious actions excite that passion, 'tis only by their relation to the person, or connexion with him. ~~. . .~~ Actions are, by their very nature, temporary and perishing; and where they proceed not from some /cause\ in the characters and disposition of the person, who perform'd them, they ~~infix not themselves upon him, and~~ can neither redound to his honour, if good, nor infamy, if evil. The actions themselves ~~itself~~ may be blameable; ~~it~~ they may be contrary to all the rules of morality and religion: But the person is not responsible for ~~it;~~ them; and as ~~it~~ they proceeded from nothing in him, that is durable ~~or~~ and constant, and leave~~s~~ nothing of that nature behind ~~it~~ them, 'tis impossible he can, upon ~~its~~ their account, become the object of punishment or vengeance. According to the ~~hypothesis of liberty,~~ principle therefore, which denies necessity, and consequently causes, a man is as pure and untainted, after having committed the most horrid crimes, as at the first moment of his birth, nor is his character any way concern'd in his actions; since they are not deriv'd from it, and the wickedness of the one can never be us'd as a proof of the depravity of the other. ~~. . .~~

Men are not blam'd for such ~~evil~~ actions as they perform ignorantly and casually, whatever may be ~~their~~ the consequences. Why? but because the ~~causes~~ principles of these actions are only momentary, and terminate in them alone. Men are less blam'd for such evil actions~~,~~ as they perform hastily and unpremeditately, than ~~for~~ from such as proceed from thought and deliberation. For what reason? but because a hasty temper, tho' a constant cause or principle in the mind, operates only by intervals, and infects not the whole character. Again, repentance wipes off every crime, ~~especially~~ if attended with ~~an evident~~ a reformation of life and manners. How is this to be accounted for? But by asserting, that actions render a person criminal, merely as they are proofs of criminal passions or principles in the mind; and when, by any alteration of these principles, they cease to be just proofs, they likewise cease to be criminal. But except upon ~~according to~~ the doctrine of ~~/liberty\ or /chance\~~ necessity, they never were just proofs, and consequently never were criminal.

23. *THN* 1.1.7.1—*EHU* 12.20 note 34 (1748: 244 note)

It seems to me not impossible to avoid these absurdities and contradictions, if it be admitted, that there is no such thing as ~~A very material question has been started concerning /~~abstract~~\~~ or ~~/~~general~~\~~ ideas, properly speaking; but ~~/whether they be general or particular in the mind's conception of them?\ A great philosopher <Dr. /Berkeley\> has disputed the receiv'd~~

~~opinion in this particular, and has asserted,~~ that all general ideas are, in reality, ~~nothing but~~ particular ones, attach'd to a general ~~annex'd to a certain~~ term, which ~~gives them a more extensive signification, and makes them~~ recalls, ~~recal~~ upon occasion, other ~~individuals,~~ particular ones, ~~which are similar to them.~~ that resemble, in certain circumstances, the idea, present to the mind.

24. *A Letter from a Gentleman* 21—*EHU* 12.23 (1748: 248)

~~[T]he Doctrines of the /Pyrrhonians\ or /Sceptieks\ have been regarded in all ages as . . . without any influence on a man's steady principles or conduct in life. . . . an universal doubt . . . it is impossible for any Man to support, and which~~ And tho' a /Pyrrhonian\ may throw himself or others into a momentary amazement and confusion by his profound reasonings; the first and most trivial ~~accident~~ event in life ~~must~~ will immediately ~~disconcert and destroy~~ put to flight all his doubts and scruples, . . .

The comparison of the above twenty-four passages may bear on disputes regarding whether Hume wrote the *Abstract* and *A Letter from a Gentleman*. The passages that descend from the *Abstract* (and not from the *Treatise*) suggest that a single author wrote the *Abstract* and *EHU*. Passages also present in the *Letter* indicate that he approved at least of those passages.

6. RECEPTION IN THE 1750S

Numerous appraisals of Hume's philosophy were published during his lifetime in books, monographs, reviews, notices, pamphlets, and articles. Serious assessment of *EHU* appeared in monographs devoted heavily to Hume and also in works with a broader purpose.

In light of this attention, it is uncertain why Hume indicates in 'My Own Life' that *EHU* was largely ignored. As noted previously, Hume complained, in good humour, that Conyers Middleton's *Free Enquiry* (1749) was receiving more critical attention than his *Philosophical Essays*, which 'was entirely overlooked and neglected'.[180] It is true that not a single review of even one of the ten lifetime editions of *EHU* appeared in English-language review media. It is also true that the book did not make an immediate splash. None the less, Hume's account of the book's reception should be placed in the context of a story about an event that occurred in either 1749 or 1750 that he relates in the very next paragraph of 'My Own Life':

[180] 'My Own Life' 8, in *Letters*, 1: 3.

my Bookseller, A. Millar, informed me, that my former Publications (all but the unfortunate Treatise) were beginning to be the Subject of Conversation, that the Sale of them was gradually encreasing, and that new Editions were demanded. Answers by Reverends and Right Reverends, came out two or three in a Year: And I found by Dr Warburtons Railing,[181] that the Books were beginning to be esteemed in good Company. However, I had fixed a Resolution, which I inflexibly maintained, never to reply to any body; and not being very irascible in my Temper, I have easily kept myself clear of all literary Squabbles. These Symptoms of a rising Reputation gave me Encouragement.[182]

Though early scholarly assessment of *EHU* was meagre, the cumulative reaction during Hume's lifetime was more extensive than he suggests. He also replied to some critics, though always in private rather than in public. Attention is restricted here to the British reception of Hume's works by philosophically attuned writers (not in all cases philosophers) who published their appraisals during Hume's lifetime. Minor pamphlets and articles were often more abusive, dogmatic, or derisive than philosophical, and these are not considered here (though several are mentioned in footnotes that cite examples of this type of literature).

Work is still under way to investigate Hume's eighteenth-century reception in countries such as France, Germany, and Italy—an extensive and complex project.[183]

Kames's Essays *(1751)*

A commotion of pamphlets and books issued throughout Hume's later career attacked his philosophy as a menace to religion and morality. In the 1750s these pamphlets were often directed at both Hume and his distant

[181] William Warburton (1698–1777), English theologian and bishop of Gloucester. He was a contentious figure who directed sustained criticism at Collins, Bolingbroke, Tindal, Voltaire, Hume, and many others. Both Warburton and his friend and biographer Richard Hurd disliked *EHU*, and both commented on the work in private communications and unpublished writings immediately after the publication of the work. For an example of 'Dr Warburtons railing' about Hume (though not one published in Hume's lifetime), see Warburton, *Letters from a Late Eminent Prelate*, 10. For work Warburton had written on *EHU*, but held back from publishing, see *A Selection from Unpublished Papers of the Right Reverend William Warburton*, 309–15 (including a letter of 7 Feb. 1757 to Hume's bookseller, Millar). Warburton railed against free-thinkers in *The Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion* (1753–67) and against Hume, in particular, in *Remarks on Mr. David Hume's Essay on the Natural History of Religion* (1757).

[182] 'My Own Life' 9, in *Letters*, 1: 3.

[183] As an example of this work, see the evidence of the reception in German reviews and books (1739–1800) in Manfred Kuehn, 'Hume in the *Göttingische Anzeigen*', and Günter Gawlick and Lothar Kreimendahl, *Hume in der deutschen Aufklärung. Umrisse einer Rezeptionsgeschichte*. Two early reviews of *EHU* in the *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen* are discussed in Kuehn, and Gawlick and Kreimendahl provide an extensive discussion of the reception of the *First Enquiry*.

relative and once intimate friend Henry Home, Lord Kames.[184] Kames's *Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion* (1751)[185] were regarded by some critics as offering little choice between Hume and Kames.[186] This appraisal was understandably not Kames's. His was the first weighty criticism of Hume's philosophy in Scotland, and, on at least one interpretation, it was an early and influential precursor of the later Scottish 'common sense theory'.

In these *Essays* Kames says he will address the philosophy of 'the author of the treatise of human nature' as well as the arguments in the *Philosophical Essays*.[187] Much of the book is structured in terms of categories and topics that Hume utilized either in the *Treatise* or his later philosophy. None the less, Kames's ultimate conclusions are, with few exceptions, independent of Hume's. In the last essay of part 1 and all of part 2—on epistemology, metaphysics, and natural religion—Kames considers (often without specific mention of Hume) Hume's accounts of liberty and necessity, belief, personal identity, the authority of the senses, the causal relation and the idea of power, induction, and various aspects of natural religion. Disagreement with Hume is evident on every topic, with the exception of liberty and necessity.[188]

[184] Henry Home became Lord Kames upon his appointment to the bench; in the discussion below he is referred to as Kames rather than Home. He was a Scottish lawyer and legal historian who was raised to the bench (as lord-in-ordinary of the Court of Session) and elevated to the High Court of Justiciary—the supreme criminal court of Scotland—in 1752. There he served until his death. Some scholars believe that Hume's relationship with Kames soured when Hume published 'Of Miracles'. In the 1730s Kames had followed Hume's drafting of the *Treatise*, forwarded a copy of it to Francis Hutcheson, and suggested a strategy to increase its sales in Scotland. See letters of 2 Dec. 1737, to Henry Home, *New Letters*, 1–3; 4 June 1739 and 1 July 1739, to Henry Home, *New Letters*, 5–7; 6 Apr. 1739, to Pierre Desmaizeaux, *Letters*, 1: 29–30. See also Apr. 1739, Hutcheson to Henry Home, in the Abercairny Collection (GD24) 553, HM Register House, Edinburgh. For the dating of the letter from Hutcheson, see Ross, 'Hutcheson on Hume's *Treatise*', 69–72.

[185] His *Essays* were originally published anonymously, under the name 'Sopho'. A second edition of his *Essays* appeared in 1758, and a third edition in 1779 (with the preface fully signed). An Edinburgh 1751 edition was in the Hume Library.

[186] For examples of the pamphlets and the combined review of Hume and Kames, see John Douglas (1721–1807), *The Criterion: or, Miracles Examined* (1754); George Anderson (1676–1756), *An Estimate of the Profit and Loss of Religion* (1753); John Bonar (1722–61), *An Analysis of the Moral and Religious Sentiments contained in the Writings of Sopho, and David Hume* (1755) (and see the more temperate reply in Hugh Blair (1718–1800), *Observations Upon a Pamphlet, intitled*, An Analysis of the Moral and Religious Sentiments contained in the Writings of Sopho, *and David Hume* (1755)); William Warburton, *Remarks on Mr. David Hume's Essay on the Natural History of Religion* (1757); *Two Letters to David Hume, by One of the People called Quakers: Containing a few Cursory Remarks on his Philosophical Essays* (1764); and John Briggs (1728/9–1804), *The Nature of Religious Zeal* (1775).

[187] *Essays*, esp. 221–7, 282–92 (also 103–19) for specific citation of Hume.

[188] The lengthy essay 3 in part 1 reaches views fundamentally similar to Hume's, with the exception of some of Kames's views about 'divine prescience and decree' and divine 'deceit' (ibid. 180, 211–12).

Criticism of doctrines in *EHU* is sustained and direct regarding Hume's theory of 'the foundation of our idea of power and necessary connection'.[189]

Kames develops an account of the nature of belief that at first glance appears similar to Hume's because Kames accounts for belief in terms of an unanalysable feeling. However, Kames explicitly rejects Hume's account of belief[190] and goes on to turn Hume's scepticism with regard to the senses, real causal powers, and knowledge of God into a non-sceptical theory rooted in the constitution of human nature. Kames holds that our senses have an authority that places us in contact with objects and events in the external world and that there exists no more basic court of appeal to ground human belief in these objects and events. His distance from Hume is evident in the following pivotal passage in the essay 'Of Belief':

> Rejecting therefore this author's opinion, the real truth appears to be this. There is a certain peculiar manner of perceiving objects, and conceiving propositions, which, being a simple feeling, cannot be described, but is expressed by the word belief. The causes of this modification, termed belief, are the authority of others, who either relate facts upon the authority of their senses, or what they have heard at second or third hand. So that belief, mediately or immediately, is founded upon the authority of our senses. We are so constituted by nature, as to put trust in our senses. Nor, in general, is it in our power to disbelieve our senses: they have authority with us irresistible.[191]

Kames argues that a fundamental flaw in Hume's philosophy (as well as Berkeley's[B]) is a failure to recognize our direct acquaintance with the external world when treating our knowledge of causal powers. A number of Hume's examples, including the shock of billiard-balls and the raising of an arm, are used to turn the argument against him, on grounds that we do indeed 'perceive a necessary connection'.[192] Kames accounts for the human awareness of God and God's activities in nature on analogous epistemic grounds, raising questions specific to Hume's concerns in Section 11 of *EHU*.

Kames's views did not escape Hume's attention. He commented soon after the book's publication that 'our Friend Harrys Essays . . . are well

[189] See ibid. 282–97. Part 2 begins on p. 219. [190] Ibid. 222.

[191] Ibid. 227. See pp. 239–40 for criticism specific to Hume's 'inveterate scepticism'. It is easy to see why some interpreters regard Kames as the precursor of the Scottish common-sense philosophy and the later treatment of Hume at the hands of the Philosophical Society of Aberdeen. This topic will be discussed below when examining the reply by Thomas Reid.

[192] Ibid. 279–91.

wrote; and are an unusual instance of an obliging method of answering a Book'.[193]

Stewart's 'Remarks on the Laws of Motion' (1754)

Hume did not, however, always express admiration for Kames's philosophical performances. In a letter of 1754 to John Stewart Hume implies that Stewart thoroughly bested Kames in a symposium.[194] This letter was occasioned by a dispute that had occurred in the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh about the foundations of mechanics, in particular a paper in which Stewart criticized Kames's views regarding whether the Newtonian theory of mechanical force and the laws of motion required activity or inactivity in matter.[195] Kames's interpretation of Newton's system exposed him to charges of determinism and denial of divine providence—charges that had already been brought against Kames and Hume independently of this paper.

In this symposium Stewart also attacked Hume for maintaining (in *EHU*) that Newton[B] held the theory that matter is active and for holding (in the *Treatise* 1.3.3) that something may begin to exist without a cause.[196] Hume replied that he never denied that all events have causes, an issue about the interpretation of the *Treatise* that must be set aside here. The pertinent matter is Stewart's criticism of Hume's claim in Section 7 of the *Philosophical Essays* that Newton used an 'etherial active Matter' to explain universal gravitation. Stewart maintained that this interpretation of Newton's theory of matter is incorrect: 'It seems to have been far from Sir *Isaac*'s intention, to ascribe activity to matter in any shape; tho' his meaning has been sometimes mistaken.' Therefore, to interpret Newton as Hume did would produce 'a manifest contradiction'.[197]

Hume does not mention the charge about Newton's ether in his letter to Stewart, but their correspondence appears to have resulted in a change in Hume's text. In 1748–50 Hume had formulated his statement of Newton's view in note 16 as follows: 'It was never the Meaning of Sir *Isaac Newton* to

[193] 22 June 1751, to Michael Ramsay, *Letters*, 1: 162.

[194] Feb. 1754, to John Stewart, *Letters*, 1: 186–7. Few facts are available about Stewart's life. He became professor in 1742 and was succeeded by Adam Ferguson in 1759.

[195] Lord Kames, 'Of the Laws of Motion'; John Stewart, 'Some Remarks on the Laws of Motion, and the Inertia of Matter'. The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, which issued this volume, became the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Hume was co-secretary of the Society at the time of his letter to Stewart. Attached to Stewart's criticisms was a footnote (p. 117) endorsing the general merit of the *Treatise*, *EHU*, and the *Essays, Moral and Political*.

[196] Stewart, 'Some Remarks on the Laws of Motion, and the Inertia of Matter', 116–17, 129–30.

[197] Ibid. 129–30; see pp. 122–3 for a comment on Clarke.

rob Matter of all Force or Energy; tho' some of his Followers have endeavour'd to establish that Theory upon his Authority. On the contrary that great Philosopher had recourse to an etherial active Matter.'[198] Stewart argued that Newton ascribed only a passive inertial power to matter; the power to initiate motion involves a power of thinking, whereas the ether is a 'general mechanical cause'.[199] Stewart was apparently attempting to follow Newton and Samuel Clarke[B] in the conviction that an *active* being has the power to initiate motion without a preceding motion; the laws of motion suggest no activity—that is, no increase in motion.

After reading the final version of Stewart's paper, Hume apparently came to appreciate the force of Stewart's interpretation of Newton. In the third edition of 1756 Hume changed the wording in note 16; 'matter' was changed to either 'second causes' or 'fluid', as the context required. Newton was no longer presented as not meaning to rob *matter* of energy or force and was presented as having recourse to an etherial active *fluid* to explain gravitation (a 'mere hypothesis'). However, Hume persisted in his views that Newton did not intend to rob second causes of force or energy and that Newtonians such as Clarke held that '*matter* has a real, though subordinate and derived power' (italics added).

Manning's Inquiry on Ratiocination *(*circa *1754)*

The title-page of the anonymously published monograph *An Inquiry into the Grounds and Nature of the Several Species of Ratiocination* reads 'By A.G.O.T.U.O.C.', meaning 'By A Gentleman of the University of Cambridge'. In fact it was written by historian Owen Manning (1721–1801), who added a subtitle indicating that the argument was directed against 'the Philosophical Essays of D. Hume'.[200] The subtitle also says that Hume's work 'is occasionally taken Notice of'. Manning's argument is plainly directed at questions *EHU* raises about inductive reasoning, experience, and custom, though Hume is mentioned only occasionally.

Manning begins with an analysis of three 'species of reasoning', each with its own domain of proof: demonstrative reasoning, moral evidence, and presumptive reasoning from induction. In section 1, on demonstrative

[198] *EHU*, 1750 edn., note to p. 118.

[199] Stewart, 'Some Remarks on the Laws of Motion, and the Inertia of Matter', 129.

[200] *An Inquiry into the Grounds and Nature of the Several Species of Ratiocination. In which, The Argument made Use of in the Philosophical essays of D. Hume, Esq; is occasionally taken Notice of* (London, n.d.). William Rose reviewed the work unfavourably (*Monthly Review*, 11 (1754), 469–70), saying that it lacked clarity, accuracy, and precision. This 1754 review can reasonably be taken as the date of the book, as Rose was a prompt and active reviewer.

reasoning, Manning defends the claim that the first principles in this domain are necessary truths, that subsequent steps in reasoning are necessarily connected, and that the conclusion is a necessary truth. In section 2 he argues that the first principles of moral evidence are necessary not from their own nature but from human nature. An example is the requirement that every event have a cause. Appealing to Hume's views on evidence and necessary connection, Manning suggests that this type of reasoning produces belief rather than knowledge. He offers a similar interpretation of Hume's account of miracles: a miracle's 'credibility is not warrantable upon any principles of reasoning'; people *believe* in miracles but have no *knowledge* (demonstration) of them.[201]

Beginning in section 3 and for the remainder of the book Manning concentrates on causation and inductive reasoning. He seems to agree with Hume that necessary connection is not detectable by the senses, that neither necessary connection nor induction can be justified by appeal to reason, and that there are stronger and weaker presumptions based on the quality of the inductive evidence.[202] None the less, Hume is criticized for his view that facts 'totally contrary to human Experience are not capable of being ascertained by human Testimony'. Manning argues that Hume assumes without warrant that 'Experience is an *exclusive* test of what is credible or incredible in the order of natural events.' The problem is that an event contrary to experience will justifiably be credible to any person 'persuaded of the Existence of a Power equal to the production of it', a persuasion that Manning thinks can rest on proper reasoning.[203]

Leland's Deistical Writers *(1754–1757)*

Beginning in 1754 the Revd John Leland (1691–1766) published two volumes of *A View of the Principal Deistical Writers of the Last and Present Century*.[204] The first edition made no mention of Hume, but in the next edition of 1755 he considered Hume extensively. He then returned to Hume in a third volume added in 1756. Leland treats Hume's views on causation and induction (letter 16), proofs of God (letter 17), and miracles (letters

[201] *Inquiry into the Grounds and Nature of the Several Species of Ratiocination*, 23–5. Manning's use of Hume is more constructive than that of those critics who take Hume to be a sceptic about the existence of causal relations and about inductive conclusions. Manning offers no sceptical interpretation. See esp. p. 24.

[202] Ibid. 31–41. [203] Ibid. 62–3.

[204] *A View of the Principal Deistical Writers of the Last and Present Century*. Several editions were issued in Hume's lifetime, with variant titles. Leland's third edition is cited below. (Leland used the second edition of *EHU*, i.e. the 1750 *Philosophical Essays*.)

18–20). He quotes extensively from Hume and offers prolonged commentary, though he finds Hume's work more for the amusement of his readers, as 'philosophical play', than a serious attempt to educate the mind.[205]

In letter 16 Leland concentrates on Hume's views that there is no necessary connection between cause and effect and his claim that 'there can be no certain, nor even probable reasoning from the one to the other'. Leland finds those views absurd and pernicious, as well as erected on inconsistencies. He regards Hume as undermining all 'argument from experience' because that argument would rest on the very relation between cause and effect that Hume denies to exist. At the root of the problem, Leland surmises, is Hume's 'excessive scepticism'.[206]

In letter 17 Hume's arguments concerning a particular providence and a future state (*EHU* 11) are examined. Leland focuses on Hume's opposition to the argument from design, his claim that arguments for God reach beyond human experience, and his thesis that we have no causal basis on which to reason to a singular divine being. Leland judges that Hume's arguments are intended to subvert the foundations of natural religion and the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. Leland does less to argue against Hume's views than to suggest that Hume has overlooked how much evidence is present in the world to support belief in a singular, supreme intelligent cause. Leland concludes that, in light of Hume's own description of the importance of religious belief and its influence on human life and conduct, Hume did not act as 'a friend to the public' in 'publishing this Essay'.[207]

In letter 18 Leland reflects on Hume's arguments concerning miracles (*EHU* 10). Leland maintains that no arguments from experience prove that miracles are impossible. Once Hume's narrow conception of experience is refined, it can be seen that direct experience with a miracle is possible and that 'competent testimony' is a proper way of judging whether an event occurred of which we personally have no 'sensible evidence'. Hume's a priori case against miracles in Part 1 therefore fails.[208]

In letter 19 Leland examines the second half of Hume's treatment of miracles, which deals with the a posteriori claim that there never has been a miraculous event established upon dependable evidence. Leland judges Hume mistaken on Hume's own criteria of sound testimony (sufficient numbers; good sense, education, and learning; integrity and non-deceptiveness; reputation; and public inspection): 'It can be shewn that the witnesses to the miracles in proof of Christianity had all the conditions and

[205] *Deistical Writers*, vol. 2, letter 16 (2: 258, 261). [206] Ibid., letter 16 (2: 262–72).
[207] Ibid., letter 17 (2: 272–83). [208] Ibid., letter 18 (2: 284–302).

qualifications, that can be required to render any testimony good and valid.' Leland also judges that non-scriptural instances of the sort Hume proclaims well-attested 'miracles', especially the example of the Abbé Pâris,[B] do not satisfy Hume's own criteria of acceptable testimony.[209]

In letter 20 Leland continues his assault on Hume's arguments concerning miracles. He is moved to write further on the subject by a letter he received. Enclosed with the letter was a manuscript critical of Hume's arguments. The manuscript had been written by 'a young gentleman then lately dead', and Leland reprints it in full. This manuscript offers two pages of criticism centred on a conflict between Hume's views on induction and testimony. The gist is this: 'the very same objection which he makes against the veracity of human testimony, to weaken its authenticity, may be retorted with equal force against his unvaried certainty of the course of nature'. Leland acknowledges that the young man has made an excellent attempt to confute Hume 'on his own principles', but thinks he has been too generous to Hume. Leland maintains that we know many events with certainty, including extraordinary and improbable events such as miracles.[210]

In a 'Supplement' published a year later (volume 3 of *Deistical Writers*), Leland returns to Hume. In letter 3 he repeats previous observations and intersperses new comments. He briefly considers Hume's accounts of belief, reason, certainty, and necessary connection before turning again to the essay on miracles. Much of the wording, argument, and quotation in this letter is taken verbatim from letter 20 in volume 2.[211]

Hume encountered Leland's book no later than 29 September 1757, when he wrote to Captain James Edmonstone: 'My compliments to Dr Leland, & tell him, that he has certainly mistaken my Character.'[212]

Price's Review of the Principal Questions *(1758)*

Richard Price (1723–91), a Welsh Dissenting minister and philosopher, published *A Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals* in 1758.[213]

[209] *Deistical Writers*, letter 19 (2: 303–35).

[210] Ibid., letter 20 (2: 336–54). Leland continues with his analysis in letter 21, where he returns to the alleged miracles surrounding the Abbé Pâris, accusing Pâris of excessive superstition. The remainder of letter 21 is concerned with Hume's moral theory in *EPM*. In a postscript Leland discusses *The Criterion* by Douglas (reference above, n. 186) and connects this work to his own discussion of Pâris and the gospel miracles. These comments are indirectly about Hume.

[211] *Deistical Writers*, vol. 3, letter 3 (3: 68–104). In letter 4 in this volume Leland takes material entirely verbatim from letter 21 in vol. 2.

[212] 29 Sept. 1757, to Captain James Edmonstone, *New Letters*, 43.

[213] This title is the original published title, carried on the first two editions. It later became *A Review of the Principal Questions in Morals* in the third edition (2nd edn. 1769, 3rd edn. 1787). Only

Though primarily a work in moral philosophy, it contains a discussion of epistemology, with criticisms of Hume. Price criticizes Hume for inadequate accounts of the foundations of knowledge, reason, impressions and ideas, induction, the self and personal identity, physical causation, divine causation, scepticism, and the use of feelings in isolation from the understanding.[214]

The criticism is centred on the *Treatise*, but Hume's *Philosophical Essays* are mentioned. Price agrees with Hume that constant conjunction is alone what we 'observe by our external senses'; thus, we never sense 'that one thing is the *cause* of another'. However, Price claims that we are aware of the 'necessity of a cause' through 'a primary perception of the understanding' and that Hume's contrary thesis plunges us into an abyss of scepticism.[215]

Hume is also faulted for his treatment of causation as applied in Section 11 of *EHU* to the design argument and theories of divine providence. Price criticizes Hume's view that in the case of 'an object *wholly singular* to us [the universe], we cannot draw any conclusions from it, or determine anything concerning its nature, designs, and properties of its *cause*, or even know that it has a *cause*'. Price argues that on a different account of 'the operations of our minds', Hume's reservations will dissipate. Price proposes to replace Hume's account of the human understanding with a more robust account of this faculty.[216]

Price also rejects Hume's thesis that all contents of the mind are either impressions or copies of impressions. Price maintains that the only way to resolve such questions is to return observers to 'common sense' and ask them to consider 'the nature of their own perceptions'. He is certain that the common observer will decide against both Hume and Locke.[217]

7. RECEPTION OF THE ESSAY ON MIRACLES

The essay on miracles was more extensively discussed than all other sections of *EHU* combined. Hume attracted no defenders, and even the reviews of the published criticisms of Hume were more sympathetic to the critic than to Hume. The published criticisms—excepting Leland's considered above—

the first two editions carried the wording '*and Difficulties*'. The third edition is used in the source cited in the References List and in the notes below.

[214] Ibid. 14–15, 25, 29, 42–3, 56, 62–3, 96 n., 212, 264–5.

[215] Ibid. 25–9. Price's *Four Dissertations* contains an extended treatment of Hume on miracles. This work is reviewed in Sect. 7.

[216] *A Review of the Principal Questions*, 264–5.

[217] Ibid. 42–3, 56, 280.

are reviewed in this section in chronological order of appearance. Because published responses to Hume's critics were invariably brief and generally repetitive, they are not examined here.[218]

Skelton's Ophiomaches: or, Deism Revealed *(1749)*

A dialogue-treatise on deism by Philip Skelton (1707–87)—entitled *Deism Revealed* after the second edition of 1751—contains in volume 2 what is perhaps the first published response to *EHU*.[219] The eight dialogues that comprise this work recount conversations between two deists, a clergyman, and a layman who is initially uncertain of his beliefs. A discussion in dialogue 5 treats Hume's analysis of miracles, with an emphasis on whether experience (understood in terms of the probability or improbability of facts) carries more authority than testimony by witnesses. The dialogue suggests that experience in Hume's sense does not preclude belief in miracles. The author has some fun with the idea that Hume's formulations introduce 'a new mathematical armour of ratios and equations' and tries to show that the argument is actually a simple one about reasons for assent.[220]

Skelton maintains that Hume's account of inductive reasoning in Section 4 of *EHU* itself shows that there is no contradiction in a miracle. On that account, a sufficient cause of a change in the course of nature can occur; if such a change is witnessed, then belief in a miraculous effect is justified. An event brought about through the power of God does have a sufficient cause. Though miracles are extraordinary occurrences, it is reasonable to believe in testimony favouring them just as it would be reasonable of one who had never seen water freeze to believe in reliable testimony that it does freeze: 'Here is a rational conviction on testimony, against experience, without ascribing the extraordinary fact to the agency of a superior being, or rendering it at all probable by any previous proof of its expediency.'[221]

Although Skelton's dialogue does not generate asserted conclusions, the impression left is that Hume has not provided a serious threat to belief in miracles.

[218] Several of these criticisms and reviews are collected in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*. Page numbers from this anthology are used below for *complete* (unedited) works and reviews. All other works are cited in their 18th-century editions.

[219] Philip Skelton, *Ophiomaches: or, Deism Revealed*, 2: 20 ff. The first edition of 1749 is cited below. This large work in two volumes is comprised of dialogues in which the objections of 'infidels' are answered.

[220] Ibid. 2: 20, 27. [221] Ibid. 2: 21–4.

Rutherforth's Credibility of Miracles *(1751)*

The Revd Thomas Rutherforth (1712–71), professor of divinity at Cambridge, published a discourse on miracles in opposition to Hume in 1751.[222] Rutherforth respectfully addresses Hume and attributes to his essay on miracles a profound impact on the modern discussion of miracles.

Rutherforth starts with basic epistemological questions. He agrees with Hume that experience and judgements about probability form an important basis of belief, but insists that they are not the only important basis. Many assertions are credible because they derive from reliable testimony; their credibility is enhanced when they are coherent with already accumulated knowledge. Numerous facts that constitute accumulated knowledge themselves rely on testimony, including testimony from many parts of the world. Furthermore, induction and experimental confirmation can yield knowledge that surpasses what is present in direct sense experience. Therefore, 'events are made as credible . . . by their conformity or consistency with our knowledge, as they are by their conformity or consistency with our experience;—And . . . when events, which are conformable to our knowledge or consistent with it, are supported by a fair testimony, our assent to them is well-grounded.'[223]

Rutherforth considers Hume's thesis that 'a firm and invariable experience amounts to a full proof' and that a miracle has this proof against it. The problem, Rutherforth contends, is that an invariable experience 'will never prove that no events, which are repugnant to these, can be brought about by the immediate interposition of him, who established these laws, and can over-rule them'. Rutherforth tries to show that we have a 'demonstrative knowledge' (not an immediate experience) of such a 'power superior to nature'. This knowledge renders miracles possible and supports their credibility. He thinks Hume's analysis fails because his premisses relate only to 'the ordinary powers of nature' and fail to allow for a superior power. Thus, miracles are not inconsistent with knowledge of God's power, which is consistent with overruling the laws of nature. From this perspective, testimony for a miracle is consistent with the main body of human experience and knowledge. Even if experience yields a direct proof of a certain order in the

[222] Thomas Rutherforth (1712–71), *The Credibility of Miracles Defended against the Author of Philosophical Essays*. Reviewed anonymously in *Monthly Review*, 5 (Oct. 1751), 358–61; both in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*, 21–37. Rutherforth's argument is rehearsed in detail in the review with no critical commentary and no new perspectives on Hume's arguments.

[223] *The Credibility of Miracles*, in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*, 21–6, quotation from p. 26.

universe that no ordinary power of nature can overcome, such experience does not undercut the idea of a power superior to nature.[224]

Rutherforth maintains that pagan and popish miracles fail these tests because evidence indicates that these alleged miracles do not derive from divine power. Hume errs, then, in treating pagan and popish miracles as if they had the same credibility as the gospel miracles.[225]

Adams's Essay *on Hume's* Essay *(1752)*

Among the earliest answers to Hume is a 103-page, paragraph-by-paragraph commentary by William Adams (1706–89). It was favourably reviewed (anonymously) by William Rose early in the same year of its publication.[226] Adams attempts to show the incorrectness of Hume's views and the correctness of the gospel miracles (and not other miracle reports, which he generally disdains). Part 1 focuses on the criteria of miracles and the legitimacy of belief in them; part 2 is concerned with the credibility of biblical miracles.

Adams's first argument turns on a thesis that 'the uniformity of nature is no way impeached or brought in question by the supposition of miracles' and that those who testify to miracles also do not bring into question the testimony of humans to the common course of nature. 'These seeming differences' are actually reconciled by 'the idea of a miracle'. Just as humans can hold lead in their hands and make it 'swim in water' when it would otherwise sink, so 'should the same be done by any invisible power, it would be a miracle. But the uniformity of nature is no more disturbed in this case than the former.' Human experience discovers the normal course of nature, but does not prove whether this order is or can be interrupted by an extraordinary power. Consequently, common experience has nothing to say about the possibility of miracles.[227]

Adams maintains that normal human expectations about nature can be legitimately reversed by single cases of testimony: 'I have no doubt that the magnet loses its polarity in very cold latitudes. I believe this upon the testimony of one man, tho' the experience of travellers in all climates before

[224] *The Credibility of Miracles*, in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*, 26–30.

[225] Ibid. 30–3.

[226] William Adams (1706–89), *An Essay in Answer to Mr. Hume's Essay on Miracles*; issued in 1752 as *An Essay on Mr. Hume's Essay on Miracles*. The 1754, second edition is cited below. The work was reviewed by William Rose in *Monthly Review*, 6 (Jan. 1752), 71–4, in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*. Rose argues that 'the objections of Mr. *Hume*, though urged with great acuteness, [are] proved to be inconclusive'; no criticisms are offered of Adams.

[227] *Essay on Mr. Hume's Essay*, 14–17, 25–6, 36.

attests the contrary. Here the most uniform experience is outweighed by a single evidence.' Reliable witnesses have attested to all the gospel miracles in such a manner that 'it is impossible to be deceived about them. Facts that are visible and palpable to the senses of mankind, that are done in open day-light' are such that witnesses 'cannot be deceived'. Thus, whether miracles have occurred must be investigated like all historical facts by assessing the reliability of those who make the reports of miracles.[228]

In part 2 Adams concentrates on the gospel miracles, how they survive Hume's negative comments about unreliable testimony, and how these miracles are different from modern alleged miracles, including Romish miracles. Adams argues that there never were miracles as well attested as the gospel miracles and that other miracles have generally been based on superstition and enthusiasm, including those that Hume relates—for example, Vespasian's[B] miracle and the French miracles. No evidence indicates that healings were miraculous even when the sick recovered in these cases. After assessing the evidence for the French miracles—as reported by Hume, Middleton, and the pertinent French books and documents—Adams concludes that Hume fails to understand that 'the disparity between these and the Gospel miracles is infinite'.[229]

Adams evaluates the parts of Hume's essay that are not covered in the above arguments as 'little more than a rude insult on the Scriptures and the Christian religion'.[230]

Ellys's Remarks *(1752)*

Anthony Ellys (1690–1761), bishop of St David's, wrote *Remarks on an Essay concerning Miracles. Published by David Hume Esq.; amongst his Philosophical Essays*, though it was published anonymously.[231] This twenty-page critique assumes that Hume's argument extends equally to miracles in profane history and in the 'the holy Scriptures' (though Ellys implies that Hume made a crude attempt to mask his intent). Ellys maintains that Hume underestimates how the duty of truth-telling together with fear of divine punishment gives religious persons an exceptionally strong motive to be truthful. He is openly sceptical of Hume's claims about the character and bias of witnesses to miracles.[232]

[228] Ibid. 20, 30–5. [229] Ibid. 44–83. [230] Ibid. 87.

[231] Anthony Ellys, *Remarks on an Essay concerning Miracles, Published by David Hume*. This monograph was reviewed favourably in *Monthly Review*, 6 (1752), 313. (Ellys refers to the pages of Hume's second edition, using the 1751 issue.)

[232] *Remarks on an Essay*, in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*, 68–71.

Ellys also rejects Hume's thesis that firm and unalterable experience conflicts with testimony on behalf of miracles. He questions the very notions of an 'unalterable Experience' and 'Laws of Nature', neither of which he regards as conflicting with testimony for miracles. He turns the example of the Indian prince against Hume, maintaining that the prince 'might have argued against the Credibility of those Accounts, exactly as our Author does against the Credibility of Miracles'. Ellys finds puzzling the claim that the prince should accept testimony against his experience, whereas a potential religious believer should not.[233]

Ellys further maintains that Hume overrates the problem of a joint opposition of miracles in different religions. He speculates that 'God sometimes permits Miracles to be wrought in false Religions' in order 'to try the good dispositions' of believers in the true religion. Using his earlier themes about the veracity and general character of witnesses, he argues that rival testimonies can only be resolved in individual cases by determining which persons give the most reliable testimony. In conclusion, he advises Hume that he 'ought not' raise '*Prejudices* in weak minds' on religious subjects that he himself is not qualified to address, and in particular should avoid 'the low Way of *insinuating*, quite without Proof, that the Evidence for the Miracles of *Moses* and of *Christ* is not at all better than what has been given for those other Miracles that he has mentioned'.[234]

Admonitions from the Dead *(1754)*[235]

This anonymously published work is presented in the form of epistles left by persons now deceased, but addressed to persons still alive. The first two letters to Hume are represented as from the recently deceased Bolingbroke (Henry Saint John, first Viscount Bolingbroke, politician and writer, 1678–1751—often viewed, like Hume, as an infidel). The material bears slightly on Section 11, but primarily on Section 10, of *EHU*.

In a first, short letter 'Bolingbroke' expresses his esteem for Hume and recounts that death has tempered his views and that he is concerned how Hume will acquit himself in his writings now that he is a person of reputation and literary influence. A second and far longer letter treats the importance of careful reflection aimed at reaching a decision about religious duties, the existence of God, and the superior religion. After asking rhetorically what he and Hume have accomplished, 'Bolingbroke' sketches some general

[233] *Remarks on an Essay*, in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*, 71–5. [234] Ibid. 75–85.

[235] *Admonitions from the Dead, in Epistles to the Living . . . to Promote the Cause of Religion and Moral Virtue*. This work is reviewed unfavourably in *Monthly Review*, 10 (1754), 311.

features of the design argument and expresses a certainty about its correctness.[236] He denounces pagan religions in strong terms, while confessing that he once rashly attacked the Jewish religion and the Old Testament, for which he repents. He suggests that Hume has similarly attacked the credibility of the New Testament in his arguments about miracles and has caused damage to the reputation of the Christian religion. He advises that Hume rectify arguments such as the one that places 'the Laws of Nature in array against the God of Nature'.[237]

Campbell's Dissertation on Miracles *(1762)*

The principal of Marischal College George Campbell (1719–96) launched the first of a set of critical appraisals of Hume to emerge from philosophers in Aberdeen (see Reid, Beattie, and Oswald below). The full title of this 1762 work is *A Dissertation on Miracles: Containing An Examination of the Principles advanced by David Hume, Esq; In an Essay on Miracles*.[238]

The first sentence of the 'Advertisement' placed at the beginning of this book states its objective: ' 'Tis not the only, nor even the chief, design of these sheets, to refute the reasoning and objections of Mr Hume with regard to miracles: the chief design of them is, to set the principal argument for Christianity in its proper light.' Campbell declares Hume's essay on miracles 'one of the most dangerous attacks that have been made on our religion' and says that the work, 'like every other work of Mr Hume, is ingenious; but its merit is more of the oratorial kind than of the philosophical'. He finds it a 'pity' that such a talented historian and essayist should have his reputation 'sullied by attempts to undermine the foundations both of *natural religion*, and of *reveal'd*!'[239]

Campbell first argues that Hume's 'favourite argument'—that of choosing on the basis of the superior evidence derived from experience—is grounded in the 'false hypothesis' that there is no justifiable presumption in favour of testimony unless it is supported by *general* experience (by contrast to *particular* experience). Campbell notes that from our infancy testimony legitimately influences belief prior to experience. Reliance on it is a part of

[236] *Admonitions from the Dead*, 11–13. [237] Ibid. 21–4.

[238] *A Dissertation on Miracles* appeared in a second edition in 1766 and in other editions after Hume's death. An anonymous, generally favourable review appeared in the *Monthly Review*, 26 (1762), 499–502; Campbell's observations are supported and Hume's 'sneers' at Christianity lamented. Campbell's work came to be widely mentioned in the literature on miracles. (In the year of Hume's death Campbell published his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, which contained occasional references to Hume, including a brief subsection on testimony.)

[239] *Dissertation on Miracles*, pp. v–vi.

common sense. We generally believe reliable witnesses until we have counter-evidence or hear reliable counter-testimony by others, and we do not count the uncommonness of an event a presumption against its reality even if the event is a single instance, such as a great disaster that has occurred despite the improbability of its occurrence. Nor is there any inconsistency in believing in the high probability of some events not occurring, while acknowledging singular exceptions.[240]

Campbell accuses Hume of never defining his pivotal term 'experience' (and of treating personal experience as if it were the same as derived experience) and also of shifting the sense of this term to suit his argument.[241] Campbell then 'insists' that, in one of Hume's own standard senses of the term,

> a fact perfectly unusual, or not conformable to our experience, such as, for aught we have had access to learn, was never observ'd in any age or country, is as incapable of proof from testimony, as miracles are; that, if this writer would argue consistently, he could never, on his own principles, reject the one, and admit the other.[242]

Campbell maintains that Hume is inconsistent in accepting testimony that supports laws of nature, while disallowing testimony for miracles. Both laws and transgressions of laws are known by, and only by, the conformity or disconformity of events to experience. That water should freeze—as in Hume's Indian prince example—is as foreign to the experience of some persons as that a dead person should come to life. Campbell maintains that Hume has put himself in the position of saying that a general state of nature that is contrary to experience (water freezing) is somehow more credible than a singular event that is contrary to experience (a person arising from the dead), but without any way of distinguishing the two based on his term 'experience'. Campbell believes that any attempt to distinguish strong from weak testimony as a way of alleviating the problem will make matters worse rather than better. If Hume means to say that a miracle could never occur because we have never observed a miracle, he begs the question. Moreover, an induction from what has been observed to what could not occur is not confirmed in experience.[243]

Campbell maintains that Hume argues as fallaciously in his use of the term 'probability' as he does in using 'experience'. Though Hume says in some passages that no testimony for a miracle can amount to a probability, Campbell tries to show that Hume acknowledges in other passages that there could be testimony for miracles that amounted to a probability (indeed, to a 'proof'

[240] *Dissertation on Miracles*, 14–27, 36, 61. [241] Ibid. 37–49.
[242] Ibid. 51. [243] Ibid. 52–9.

and 'for certain', Campbell argues).[244] The net result is that Hume is confused and inconsistent: ''Tis therefore manifest, that either this author's principles condemn his own method of judging, with regard to miraculous facts; or that his method of judging subverts his principles, and is a tacit desertion of them.'[245]

These foundational arguments about fallaciousness and inconsistency secured, Campbell argues that there are grounds for a presumption in favour of religious miracles (those of the Christian religion, in particular) and that Hume's methods of argument and historical arguments are unconvincing. Campbell finds it intriguing that Hume the historian and advocate of experience has recourse to claims about history that experience either cannot confirm or can prove false.[246]

Through their mutual friend Hugh Blair (1718–1800), Campbell's book was submitted in manuscript for Hume's evaluation. Campbell wished to know whether he had reliably reported Hume's views and sought an evaluation of the arguments and the composition. Hume did not challenge Campbell's representations of his views, but found the book uneven in both argument and tone. At times, he said, it is generous 'beyond what I can presume to deserve', but 'some other passages [seem] more worthy of Warburton and his followers than of so ingenious an author', with the consequence that Campbell is 'a little too zealous for a philosopher'. Hume offered a few philosophical questions about Campbell's reasoning, centred on topics of testimony, evidence, and proof. His replies indicate why Campbell's arguments were not sufficiently compelling to induce Hume to change his views in subsequent editions.[247]

Price's Four Dissertations *(1767)*

Richard Price, best known for his *Review of the Principal Questions in Morals* (discussed above), published *Four Dissertations* in 1767. Some uncharitable references to Hume were deleted in a new edition a year later.[248] The first dissertation, on providence, and the fourth, on miracles, both at first glance

[244] Ibid. 61–8. [245] Ibid. 70. [246] Ibid. 71 ff.

[247] Late 1761, to Hugh Blair, *Letters*, 1: 348–51; and 7 June 1762, to George Campbell, *Letters*, 1: 360–1; and Campbell's report and publication of correspondence in the 1796–7 posthumous editions of his *Dissertation on Miracles*, vol. 1, 2 ff. (also in later editions). In his letter Hume says that 'I have, long since, done with all inquiries on such subjects, and am become incapable of instruction.' Campbell was chagrined that Hume was unwilling to alter the essay.

[248] (London, 1767). The second edition (London, 1768) is cited here. (Price's presentation copy of the 1768 edition is found in the Hume Library.) Despite the 1767 date, Price uses Hume's second edition. A lengthy review of *Four Dissertations* appears in *Monthly Review*, 36 (Feb. 1767), 51–93, with 81 ff. pertinent to Hume's essay on miracles. This review generally affirms Price's views.

appear relevant to Hume's Sections 10–11. However, only the fourth—entitled 'On the Importance of Christianity, the Nature of Historical Evidence, and Miracles'—is directed at Hume, and it alone is considered here.

Price begins with general observations about evidence for and objections to Christianity. This commentary takes him to Hume's treatment of miracles, to which Price devotes some fifty pages. He argues that Hume's exposition is contrary to reason and rests on 'false principles' rooted in Hume's views on induction in Sections 4 and 5 of *EHU*. He also faults Hume for concluding that expectations based on sound induction are grounded in instinct rather than knowledge. Price believes that we have knowledge based on 'something in the constitution of natural causes'.[249]

Price explores 'the ground of the regard we pay to *human testimony*' and finds that the ground is not experience alone. Since 'a regard to truth' is a principle of human nature, reasonable persons expect to be told the truth by other reasonable persons, even when they have no prolonged relationship. From this perspective, 'to use *testimony* to prove a *miracle* implies no absurdity'. In such testimony an event is established by 'a direct and positive proof' that does not rely on inductive experience.[250]

Price considers Hume's conceptual thesis that a miracle is contrary to experience and proposes that 'A miracle is more properly an event *different* from experience than *contrary* to it.' One can see an event of a type that one has never before experienced, and eyewitnesses can testify to novel experiences. Testimony for miracles is a 'direct and positive proof' of an event that 'previously to the event, there would have appeared to us a presumption against its happening'. Hume is wrong, then, to claim that testimony for miracles entails 'a contest of two opposite experiences'. Nor does Hume have a better claim in his 'fundamental point' that there is a greater probability against a miracle's occurring than the probability of testimony establishing it. If this thesis were accepted, Price argues, virtually no 'particular histories' based on testimony would ever be accepted, because few are probable: 'It is then very common for the slightest testimony to overcome an almost infinite improbability'; moreover, 'improbabilities *as such* do not lessen the capacity of testimony to report truth'.

Price offers ingenious examples of high-probability testimony about events with a low probability of occurrence. He argues that we should set aside what is known about the probability of an event when the judgement that must be reached is one of the reliability of testimony about an improb-

[249] *Four Dissertations*, 388–97. [250] Ibid. 398–401.

able event. He reaches a conclusion that he believes undercuts Hume's arguments: 'improbabilities *as such* do not lessen the capacity of testimony to report truth'. This is a straightforward challenge to Hume's views about the relevance of prior probabilities.[251]

When a set of facts is reported by reliable eye- and ear-witnesses, Price thinks 'we should be under a necessity of believing them'. This necessity is applicable in the instance of the gospel narratives that report Jesus's performance of miracles and resurrection. The '*extraordinary* facts that they relate are blended with the *common*' stories they tell about Jews, Romans, Judas's treachery, and Jesus's crucifixion; if we believe the latter, why should we not believe the former? Hume is wrong, Price concludes, to maintain that there is an incredibility in miracles incapable of being sustained by testimony.[252]

Price forwarded a copy of his book to Hume with a letter stating that he would further moderate the tone in a future edition. Hume appreciated Price's philosophical abilities and wrote that he found the *Four Dissertations* written with a civility rarely to be found in the treatment of religious subjects. In a moment of exceptional commendation, Hume said that 'you overwhelm me with the Weight of your Arguments'.[253] Hume's generous comment may be his way of recognizing that Price's objections were the most philosophically astute that he had received.

Priestley's Institutes *(1772–1774)*

Joseph Priestley's *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion* contains several criticisms of Hume's account of miracles. His views are treated in the next section.

8. RECEPTION IN THE 1760s AND 1770s

The Aberdeen Philosophical Society[254] took the philosophy of Hume as a topic of discussion and played a role in several works that criticized Hume (in

[251] Ibid. 401–23. Price develops an account of the probabilities in several examples to show that Hume's theses about probability are implausible. He returns to this topic later (pp. 430 ff.).

[252] Ibid. 423–8, 438–9.

[253] 18 Mar. 1767, to Richard Price, *New Letters*, 233–4.

[254] The Society had been established 12 Jan. 1758 with six members, including Reid, George Campbell, David Skene, John Stewart, Robert Trail, and John Gregory. Alexander Gerard and James Beattie joined the Society by 1760. The Society lasted until 1773. It was not a group with a uniform voice, but Hume was generally viewed as a challenge needing a counter-challenge. See Holcomb, 'Reid in the Philosophical Society', 413–20; H. Lewis Ulman (ed.), *The Minutes of the Aberdeen Philosophical Society*; and Paul B. Wood, *The Aberdeen Enlightenment*.

addition to Campbell's). The authors often discussed the *Treatise* and *EHU* together, as if they were a unified philosophy. Their continued emphasis on the *Treatise* may be a motivating factor in Hume's decision to disavow that work in the Advertisement he appended to his works in 1776. This conclusion seems warranted by a famous statement he made to Strahan in which he proclaimed the Advertisement 'a compleat Answer to Dr. Reid and to that bigotted silly Fellow, Beattie'.[255] It seems less a complete answer—or any form of answer, in the ordinary sense—than a way of dismissing critics who concentrated too frequently on the *Treatise*.[256]

In light of Hume's comment, it is suitable to begin this section with Reid, for whom Hume had the deepest respect,[257] and then to move to Beattie, for whom he did not. Analysis of their works paves the way for a discussion of James Oswald and Joseph Priestley.

Reid's Inquiry *(1764)*

Scottish Presbyterian minister and philosopher Thomas Reid (1710–96) published *An Inquiry into the Human Mind* in 1764.[258] Reid treated a number of themes common to Hume's *Treatise* and *EHU*, including those regarding the association of ideas, induction, causation, belief, and the analysis of testimony. Reid was most concerned with Hume's theories of perception and scepticism.

Reid thought that Hume's philosophy must be understood in light of a modern philosophical tradition traceable to Descartes,[B] Malebranche,[B] Locke,[B] and Berkeley.[B] [259] Virtually all of Hume's failures derive from assumptions he draws from this tradition, Reid believed, especially Hume's appeal to what Reid calls 'the theory of ideas', 'the way of ideas', and the 'ideal theory'. This theory holds that all human awareness and thought require ideas; even in perception we encounter only ideas, not objects and

[255] 26 Oct. 1775, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 301.

[256] This problem is examined in Somerville, *The Enigmatic Parting Shot: What was Hume's 'Compleat Answer to Dr Reid and to That Bigotted Silly Fellow, Beattie'?*

[257] 25 Feb. 1763, to Thomas Reid, *Letters*, 1: 375–6: 'I must do you the justice to own, that when I enter into your ideas, no man appears to express himself with greater perspicuity than you do.' See also Hume's letter of 4 July 1762, to Hugh Blair, noted below, n. 265.

[258] *An Inquiry into the Human Mind, on the Principles of Common Sense*. This systematic treatise is not primarily a work on Hume, but Reid often discusses Hume's philosophy. Since Reid's *Inquiry* was his only work published during Hume's lifetime, this work alone is examined here. References are provided to Reid's *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man* to the extent that it develops relevant themes in the *Inquiry*.

[259] *Inquiry* 1.3–8, 5.8, 6.5; cf. *Intellectual Powers* 2.10, 14; 5.6.

events directly. Reid believes this system is 'now generally received', but has 'scepticism inlaid in it, and reared along with it'.[260] He found Hume the most consistent of the modern philosophers in pointing to the implications of the ideal theory and the person who had most clearly grasped the theory.

Reid attacks the doctrine of impressions as the means by which Hume severs the connection between perceiver and perceived (real objects, events, and powers). This position is erected on the ideal theory, and Reid thinks it naturally led Hume to an unargued alliance with Berkeley against the justifiability of belief in a material world.

> [I]n all this debate about the existence of a material world, it hath been taken for granted on both sides, that this same material world, if any such there be, must be the express image of our sensations; that we can have no conception of any material thing which is not like some sensation in our minds; and particularly that the sensations of touch are images of extension, hardness, figure, and motion. Every argument brought against the existence of a material world, either by the Bishop of Cloyne, or by the author of the 'Treatise of Human Nature', supposeth this. If this is true, their arguments are conclusive and unanswerable; but, on the other hand, if it is not true, there is no shadow of argument left. Have those philosophers, then, given any solid proof of this hypothesis, upon which the whole weight of so strange a system rests? No. They have not so much as attempted to do it. . . . They have taken it for granted.[261]

Reid did not treat the subtleties of either Hume's distinctions between types of scepticism or his mitigated scepticism. Reid preferred to point to Hume's view that philosophical reasoning reaches conclusions opposed to instinct and common belief. From Descartes to Hume, Reid thought, philosophy had been set in opposition to common sense. This philosophy held that we do not know a material world, whereas common sense assured us that there is a material world.[262] He isolated Hume as the chief culprit in the turn to scepticism:

> I observe, That the modern scepticism is the natural issue of the new system; and that, although it did not bring forth this monster until the year 1739 [when Hume's *Treatise* was published], it may be said to have carried it in its womb from the beginning. . . .
>
> Thus we see that Des Cartes and Locke take the road that leads to scepticism, without knowing the end of it; but they stop short for want of light to carry them farther. Berkeley, frighted at the appearance of the dreadful abyss, starts aside, and avoids it. But the author of the 'Treatise of Human Nature', more daring and

[260] *Inquiry* 1.7, 5.7–8.
[261] Ibid. 5.7; cf. *Intellectual Powers* 1.1.6–7, 11; 2.5, 10, 14.
[262] *Inquiry* 2.6, 5.7–8, 7.

intrepid, without turning aside to the right hand or the left, like Virgil's Alecto, shoots directly into the gulf.[263]

Reid maintained that Hume knew very well that he was using such sceptical arguments. Reid was convinced that the first principles deriving from the constitution of human nature were either not recognized by Hume or rejected by him. Reid conceded that neither experience nor reason is the source of our beliefs about material and spiritual substance and various features of causality, but he thought Hume's resort to custom or habit no better than the appeals made by other philosophers to reason. Reid thought that the correct metaphysical principles are self-evident.[264]

Reid sought and received Hume's comments on the manuscript of his *Inquiry*. Reid submitted portions to Blair, who served as middleman. Hume found in Reid's *Inquiry* 'a Quality seldom to be met with in Performances of that Nature; which is that it is wrote in a lively entertaining manner & will be able to fix the Attention even of those who are the [least] curious about metaphysical Reasonings'. Hume goes on to pay respect by tendering some cautious and brief philosophical assessments.[265] Reid tactfully declared Hume's comments 'polite and friendly'.[266]

Reid also expressed a charitable view of the contributions that Hume's philosophy had made in Reid's philosophical development.

> I shall always avow myself your Disciple in Metaphysicks. I have learned more from your writings in this kind than from all others put together. Your system appears to me not onely coherent in all its parts, but likewayse justly deduced from principles commonly received among Philosophers: Principles, which I never thought of calling in question, until the conclusions you draw from them in the Treatise of human Nature made me suspect them. If these principles are solid your system must stand.[267]

Reid suggests here and elsewhere that it was only when he saw the *conclusions* that Hume drew from his principles that the principles themselves came into doubt.[268] Thus perplexed by a system of plausible principles with implausible conclusions, Reid was driven to an alternative philosophy. This

[263] *Inquiry* 7 (Conclusion). [264] Ibid. 5.3, 7; 6.24; 7; cf. *Intellectual Powers* 2; 6.5–6.

[265] Letter of 4 July 1762, to Hugh Blair, Aberdeen University Library, MS 2814/1/39, as pub. in Paul B. Wood, 'David Hume on Thomas Reid's *An Inquiry into the Human Mind*', 415–16.

[266] Letter from Reid to Hume, 18 Mar. 1763, in Burton (ed.), *Life and Correspondence of David Hume*, 154–5.

[267] Ibid. 154–6. In the 'Dedication' to his *Inquiry* Reid reports that Hume provoked him to think about how to rescue the principles of the human understanding from the consequences of sceptical assumptions.

[268] 'Dedication', in *Inquiry*.

philosophy was to influence deeply several other figures, notably James Beattie.

Balfour's Philosophical Essays *(1768)*

James Balfour of Pilrig (1705–95), a well-connected aristocrat, Presbyterian, and professor of moral philosophy at Edinburgh (the position once sought by Hume), produced a lengthy monograph in 1753 (published anonymously) entitled *A Delineation of the Nature and Obligation of Morality*. It carried a subtitle with a direct reference to Hume.[269] Balfour focused on themes in Hume's *moral* philosophy, but he also treated the 'intellectual faculty' and 'deliberate principle', while criticizing Hume's appeal to sentiment and attack on reason.[270]

Balfour returned to Hume's philosophy in *Philosophical Essays*, published in 1768. These essays primarily treat Hume's work in *EHU* on the topics of scepticism, power and necessary connection, liberty and necessity, and miracles. Balfour defended active power and liberty against Hume (and Kames) and resisted Hume's scepticism and theory of ideas. He is generous only in his comment on Hume's ability: 'Of the modern writers who have patronised the sceptical philosophy, none perhaps has wrote with more acuteness than Mr. Hume . . . [in his] *Of Academical or Sceptical Philosophy*' (*EHU* 12).[271]

Balfour was none the less entirely unconvinced by Hume's arguments. In a few pages he dismisses Hume's account of the external senses, necessary connection, the foundations of mathematical truth, matter and its division, and the nature of time.[272] The most sustained attack is on Hume's scepticism. Balfour says that this 'most determined scepticism' moves to 'the highest extravagance of dogmatism'. The *consequences* of this scepticism exercised Balfour: 'It must introduce an universal lethargy and insensibility; as it destroys all distinction betwixt truth and falsehood, good and evil, there can remain no principle to prompt us to action, nor any object to concern ourselves about.'

Balfour suggests that Hume was aware of these devastating consequences and tried to minimize them with 'a more mitigated scepticism'. Balfour sees this manœuvre as a 'palpable peace [*sic*] of sophistry' that never reaches truth. Since Hume's appeals to instinct are also unconvincing, we are 'thrown

[269] *With Reflexions upon Mr. Hume's Book, intitled*, An Inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals.

[270] *A Delineation*, 14–16, 70, 173.

[271] *Philosophical Essays*, 36.

[272] Ibid. 37–42.

into' an 'absolute scepticism'. On this basis, Balfour thinks, Hume attempts to banish religion from human thought.[273] Balfour also briefly examines Hume's accounts of power and miracles, two features of reality Balfour thinks Hume tried to undermine.[274]

Hume had complained after Balfour's first book, and in subsequent correspondence with him (conducted through a publisher), that Balfour's interpretation unfairly rendered him a sceptic:[275]

> I must only complain of you a little for ascribing to me the sentiments which I have put into the mouth of the Sceptic in the Dialogue.[276] I have surely endeavoured to refute the Sceptic with all the force of which I am master; and my refutation must be allowed sincere, because drawn from the capital principles of my system.

Balfour ignored this petition and throughout his career criticized Hume's philosophy in lectures. One of Balfour's students, historian Thomas Somerville (1741–1830), said that Balfour's only well-received lectures in his moral philosophy class were on central doctrines in Hume's *Essays and Treatises*, which, Somerville reported, were 'then universally read'.[277]

Beattie's Essay *(1770)*

James Beattie (1735–1803), professor of moral philosophy and logic at Marischal College, was another member of the Aberdeen circle. His *Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth*, published in 1770 (with numerous subsequent editions), attacked scepticism, chiefly Hume's. Beattie thought scepticism had become 'the profession of every fashionable inquirer into human nature'. He counted Descartes,[B] Malebranche,[B] Locke,[B] Berkeley,[B] and Hume among the sceptics. Beattie depicts Hume as the deepest and most dangerous sceptic—an arch-sceptic whose views have the potential 'to overturn all belief, virtue, and science, from the very foundation'.[278]

Beattie located Hume's fundamental mistake in the distinction between impressions and ideas: Hume's thesis that impressions and ideas are 'the same', one being 'weaker and fainter' than the other, was a 'pillar' of his system, but in the end merely 'a false hypothesis taken for granted'. This dis-

[273] *Philosophical Essays*, 40, 43–50, 58. [274] Ibid. 73–80, 120–2.

[275] 15 Mar. 1753, to the [anonymous] Author, *Letters*, 1: 172–4 (quotation p. 173).

[276] The reference is to 'A Dialogue', which is appended to *EPM*.

[277] Thomas Somerville, *My Own Life and Times: 1741–1814*, 16–17. Somerville entered Edinburgh University in 1756. Other work on Hume by Balfour appeared in 1782 in *Philosophical Dissertations*, 159–74; but this work was published after Hume's death and will not be considered here.

[278] *An Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth*, 6, 9, 12, 248 ff. Beattie used the 1767 edition of *EHU*.

tinction led Hume to another mistake, which is the denial of the validity of the distinction between objects and perceptions. Beattie accuses Hume of a failure to appreciate the difference between the thing perceived and impressions of the thing perceived conveyed to the mind by means of an organ of sensation.[279]

Beattie abhorred the free-thinking on which Hume's doctrines were erected, and even attacked Hume's 'character' as 'replete with inconsistency'.[280] The bulk of the criticism was directed at the *Treatise* but also reached into *EHU*, especially Sections 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12.[281] Beattie seems to think that mischief results when Hume's doctrine of causation is joined with his theory of impressions. The latter promotes the false notion that we are not in touch with powers in nature, which in turn feeds Hume's determinism and anti-theological doctrines.

Beattie rarely argues against Hume's position. His preference is to find Hume's views inconsistent with the assumptions of common sense.[282] In the constructive sections of his book on the nature and immutability of truth, Beattie argues that humans have a grasp of first principles that protects these principles from sceptical assault. We reach truth in so far as we believe what the law of human nature determines us to believe without proof. In some cases, evidence is required to attain truth, whereas in other cases an instinct of nature is sufficient—a doctrine again tied to a philosophy of common sense.[283] Beattie is quick to reject Hume's views in the *Treatise* (and similar views in Section 1 of *EHU*) that an 'easy and obvious' philosophy carries a strong presumption against it. To the contrary, Beattie declares, 'in regard to the few things I have to say on human nature . . . I should esteem it a very strong presumption against them, if they were not easy and obvious.'[284] Near the end of his book Beattie finds comfort in the opinions of Hume's critics:

[279] Ibid. 249–50, 256–7.

[280] Ibid. 9–11, 444–7. Beattie judges Hume of such a decidedly 'liberal turn' of mind that he sneered at devotional works like *The Whole Duty of Man*—a work Hume once indicated to be narrow on the subject of virtue (*EPM*, n. 72). Beattie thinks that Hume 'adopted the most illiberal prejudices against natural and revealed religion'.

[281] If Hume thought that Beattie referred only to the *Treatise*, he was mistaken. If he thought Beattie referred primarily to the *Treatise*, he was correct. Beattie, Reid, and his other Aberdeen critics may not have known before 1776 that Hume regarded the *Treatise* as little more than a juvenile work. This fact complicates the interpretation of Hume's Advertisement. However, Hume does not speak in the Advertisement specifically about Beattie, Reid, or anyone else. His private comment about them may not provide the most suitable interpretation of the relevant line in the Advertisement.

[282] *Essay*, 115–20, 135–6, 154, 164–5, 310–11, 377–8, 457–8, 487.

[283] Ibid. 31, 41–7, 62, 111, 377–8.

[284] Ibid. 17.

what are we to think of a [John] Douglas, a [George] Campbell, a[n Alexander] Gerard, a [Thomas] Reid, and some others, who have attacked many of Mr Hume's opinions, and proved them to be contrary to truth, and subversive of the good of mankind? I thought indeed, that the works of those excellent writers had given great satisfaction to the friends of truth and virtue.[285]

After learning of Hume's Advertisement, Beattie said that he was surprised by Hume's comments and that he sincerely regarded the *Treatise* as the foundation of all of Hume's philosophy; it therefore merited treatment as serious as the later philosophy.[286] Beattie no doubt took comfort in the fact that his book had been lavishly praised (and Hume's philosophy spiritedly denounced) in an unusually lengthy article in the *Monthly Review*. The reviewer, who recognized the book as fundamentally an attack on Hume, endorsed this 'excellent antidote against scepticism and infidelity'.[287] This praise would have been known to Hume and was a possible stimulus to his Advertisement and caustic comment about Beattie.

Five Letters to the Weekly Magazine *(1771)*

Five anonymous letters pertaining to Beattie's criticisms of Hume were published in the *Weekly Magazine, or Edinburgh Amusement* in 1771.[288] Two letters by 'Orthodoxus' and 'Democritus' criticize Beattie for the insulting style of his critique of Hume. 'Orthodoxus' reviews Beattie's book and concludes that, although Hume's principles are not admirable, Beattie has overstated both the importance of scepticism and the danger (especially to religion) of Hume's philosophy—and has done so in an unjustifiably acrimonious style. Some concern is expressed that Beattie's indictment is so fierce that it might provoke a legal response against Hume. As a matter of etiquette and style, 'Orthodoxus' suggests that Beattie should have presented his views about Hume's philosophy with the generosity and professional skill found in the writings of Reid.

Three letters are responses by 'Eumenes', first to the letter by 'Orthodoxus' and then two additional responses after publication of the letter from 'Democritus'. 'Eumenes' resists the idea that a sceptical philosophy like Hume's has no significant harmful effects on religion. Beattie is said to have

[285] Ibid. 493. All named individuals are mentioned above or below in this Introduction; see also the Annotations.

[286] Beattie, *An Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth*, in *Essays* (1776 edn.), preface, pp. xi–xii.

[287] *Monthly Review*, 42 (1770), Article 7, 450–7; and 43 (1771), Article 5, 268–83.

[288] 'Orthodoxus', 'Democritus', and 'Eumenes', *Weekly Magazine, or Edinburgh Amusement*, 13 (1771), 51–2, 97–102, 195–8, 265–9, 358–60.

been motivated by the concern of an apologist for Christianity, and not by animosity or ill will towards Hume. The blunt and uncharitable language that he uses is declared suitable to his ambition to prevent the spread of Hume's influence, which 'Eumenes' presumes a serious threat to religion. 'Eumenes' is convinced that even the *Treatise* remains an influential and widely circulated work, especially among those who engage in literary conversation. If its influence is waning, the brilliant writing of Reid and those after him who have striven to oppose 'its malignity' are responsible. However, 'Eumenes' believes that the 'taste and genius' found in Hume's writings will allow them to flourish indefinitely.[289]

In the remainder of the first letter and in the other two, 'Eumenes' defends Beattie against charges of inconsistency and abusive writing. 'Democritus' had raised questions about Beattie's 'invective' and abusive style and was no less critical of 'Eumenes' for long-winded, vacuous writing. Moreover, 'Democritus' thinks that 'Eumenes' is a pedant who overrates the importance of these issues for the general public. In the exchange over these matters Hume's philosophy plays a minor role. 'Eumenes' denies that Hume is in any legal jeopardy as a result of Beattie's attacks and assures readers that he ('Eumenes') will 'be among the first to interpose' for Hume's safety were any personal danger to arise. 'Eumenes' also defends Beattie's attacks on Hume's philosophy as not inflammatory or insensitive.[290]

Oswald's Appeal to Common Sense *(1766–1772)*

The Revd James Oswald (1703–93), a prominent Scottish Cleric, wrote *An Appeal to Common Sense in Behalf of Religion* more in the service of theology than philosophy.[291] Unlike the work of Reid and Beattie, it is not written specifically against Hume, though Hume is often mentioned and the book was written in part to rescue philosophy and theology from the clutches of scepticism. Oswald's extensive 'appeals' to 'the authority of common sense'—and *reason*, which for him is the functional equivalent of common sense—were aimed at the protection of what he calls 'primary truths' known with 'indubitable certainty'. Often his goal is the protection of theological doctrines from subversion by sceptics. Oswald believes that religion has a status and dignity not needing the assistance of philosophy.[292]

[289] 'Eumenes', *Weekly Magazine*, 99–100.

[290] Ibid. 358–9; 'Democritus', *Weekly Magazine*, 196–7.

[291] *An Appeal to Common Sense in Behalf of Religion*, 2 vols. Volume 1 was published in 1766 as a complete work.

[292] Ibid. See esp. 1: 8–10, 17–18, 26–7, 40–1, 66–7, and the initial pages of vol. 2.

He repudiates Hume as one among several philosophers, commencing with Descartes,[B] who make assumptions about the need to provide epistemic warrant for foundational truths. Bayle,[B] Locke,[B] and Kames are faulted for this and other unwarranted forms of scepticism.[293] Hume is judged to have had the insight to see the seeds of scepticism in Locke, but to have moved in the wrong direction, missing the solution in common sense. Hume is also found in error on necessary connection, reason, custom, and all sceptical conclusions, including those about religious belief and the attributes of God. Oswald declares that Hume cannot consistently carry his sceptical conclusions beyond his study and therefore must in practice affirm what he has sceptically denied.[294]

Priestley's Institutes *(1772–1774) and* Examination *(1774)*

From 1772 to 1774 chemist and theologian Joseph Priestley (1733–1804) published his *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion*.[295] He followed this work with *An Examination of Dr. Reid's* Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense, *Dr. Beattie's* Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth, *and Dr. Oswald's* Appeal to Common Sense in Behalf of Religion.[296] Priestley's assessments were heavily guided by theological convictions, and they treated Hume's views only sporadically and together with the views of numerous other figures.

Hume's discussions (in Section 11) of the argument from design, divine providence and other attributes, and the idea of a future state were among Priestley's major concerns. His discussion of design and divine attributes appears in part 1, and of providence and a future state in part 2, section 4. Hume is mentioned only occasionally by name, and Priestley's strategy appears to be to treat him more as an unbeliever lacking proper understanding than a philosopher in need of rebuttal.[297] Hume is sternly criticized for his moral views, in part because his views on religion led him to reject conduct recommended in the gospels: 'he intends to stigmatize as a vice, that which is recommended in the gospel as an amiable virtue'.[298]

[293] *An Appeal to Common Sense in Behalf of Religion*, 1, bks. 2–3.

[294] Ibid. 1: 94–6, 100, 111–12, 127–33.

[295] Joseph Priestley, *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion*, 3 vols. (London, 1772–4). The first edition cited below is vol. 1 of the second edition of 1782. The second edition is the collected works of 1817–32.

[296] Joseph Priestley, *An Examination of Dr. Reid's* Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense, *Dr. Beattie's* Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth, *and Dr. Oswald's* Appeal to Common Sense in Behalf of Religion (London, 1774).

[297] *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion* 2.1.4 (1782, 1: 240; 1817–32, 2: 104).

[298] Ibid. 2.1.3 (1782, 1: 214; 1817–32, 2: 90).

Priestley reserves his most caustic, and only sustained, criticism for Hume's account of testimony and the credibility of miracles. He begins with the theory that a 'principal evidence of revelation depends upon *human testimony*'; testimony is one kind of historical evidence based on experience. Priestley accuses Hume of failing to take seriously his own doctrine that induction does not prove the absolute uniformity of the laws of nature. Even if the course of nature has always proceeded in a particular manner, our experience of that process forms only an expectation that the same uniformity will continue. There is no proof that it will continue, and no basis has been established to preclude a miracle that interrupts our expectations. These considerations form the basis of Priestley's charge that Hume begs the question, because

> it is asserted by the friends of revelation, that the course of nature has not always proceeded without interruption, but that, for great and good purposes, the divine author of it has not confined himself to it, but has occasionally departed from it. In reality, therefore, all that Mr. Hume has advanced . . . is that there have been no miraculous events because there have been none.

Priestley wonders how 'new facts' are ever to be established, given Hume's views on causal reasoning. Any departure from past experience of the uniformity of nature must fall under suspicion, no matter the particular evidence or testimony.[299]

Priestley's book on Reid, Beattie, and Oswald is not directed at Hume, except 'in some measure, *indirectly*', as he puts it in the preface.[300] The primary goal is what Priestley thought to be a common line of vague and impoverished thought about common sense that emanated from Reid. However, since each of these authors is criticizing Hume, Priestley is moved to comment on their assessments of him (as well as Berkeley[B]). He is unimpressed with the common-sense criticisms of Hume. For example, he judges Reid too lenient in dealing with Hume's treatment of the theory of ideas and thinks that other writers have answered Hume more ably (including himself in his *Institutes*).

On one interpretation, Priestley's book vindicates Hume's scientific approach in opposition to Scottish common-sense philosophy. Priestley admired Locke,[B] and to the extent Hume is refining Locke he stands to be admired by Priestley. However, Priestley could find little more than scepticism and the subversion of religion in Hume. Hume's views were grudgingly acknowledged to provide a 'service' to religious writers by the

[299] Ibid. 2.2.3 (1782, 1: 262 ff.; 1817–32, 2: 115 ff.).
[300] *An Examination of Dr. Reid's* Inquiry . . . , p. xxvii.

sharpness of his criticisms, but Priestley found little merit in Hume. On the whole, it was Locke and Hartley that he took seriously, not the 'sophistry of Mr. Hume'.[301]

Priestley had more to say about Hume in other works. In the first part of his *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*,[302] he offered a sustained criticism of many of Hume's views on epistemology, metaphysics, and natural religion. However, this book was published after Hume's death, and therefore is not reviewed here.

Conclusion

For almost thirty years Hume watched his peers react to *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*. Although they more often opposed than supported his views, he accepted critical appraisal with some equanimity, and occasionally even with a sportive good humour. He reported that his *Enquiry* 'was at first little more successful than the Treatise of Human Nature', but he seems not to have been dispirited by the lack of attention devoted to *EHU* in its early years: 'these disappointments made little or no impression on me'.[303] He also knew, after nine revised editions, that *EHU* had secured a depth of international recognition enjoyed by few philosophical works.

Hume apparently lowered his expectations for standing in philosophy after his experience with the *Treatise* and the failed candidacy for the Edinburgh chair. What he truly thought about the merits of his philosophy and his place in the history of philosophy are matters we may never ascertain. But we should take seriously the unintended tribute he paid to himself when he commented to Gilbert Elliot that *EHU* contains 'every thing of Consequence relating to the Understanding, which you woud meet with in the *Treatise*. . . . By shortening and simplifying the Questions, I really render them much more complete.'[304]

[301] *An Examination of Dr. Reid's* Inquiry . . . , pp. xxvi–xxviii, 62–5, 116–17, 221–2.

[302] *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever. . . . An Examination of the Principal Objections to the Doctrines of Natural Religion, and especially those contained in the Writings of Mr. Hume* (1780).

[303] 'My Own Life' 8–9.

[304] Mar. or Apr. 1751, to Gilbert Elliot of Minto, *Letters*, 1: 158.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT

An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding (*EHU*) was first published in 1748. From 1758 to 1777 this work appeared in the collection published under the title *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects* (*ETSS*). The last edition seen through the press with Hume's supervision appeared in 1772. This edition is the copytext in the present edition. The posthumous edition of 1777 has been consulted for evidence of late authorial changes and generally has been followed when the changes are substantive, but not when they are purely formal. A history of Hume's editions of *EHU*, with pertinent bibliographical data, is provided in the Introduction.

The text was initially prepared from a photocopy of the 1772 edition of *ETSS* in the Hume collection of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, McGill University Libraries.[1] This copy has been inspected for printing or photocopying vagaries by collating it with three originals of the 1772 edition privately acquired by the editor. In addition, two of the privately acquired copies and seven additional copies obtained from libraries[2] were optically (or 'mechanically') collated against one of the other privately acquired copies using a McLeod Portable Collator.[3] David Fate Norton and his associates performed these collations of the 1772 copies either at his office or at the Colgate Collection of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, McGill University Libraries in Montreal. Several variants were discovered by these collations, but none proved to be significant.[4] All differences appear to have been generated by imperfect inking or type problems (breakages of type or slippage in the position of the type during printing). In

[1] Shelf-mark B1455 1772 v.2 c.1.

[2] Special Collections Divisions of the following libraries: Chuo University, Tokyo (Vault); Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC (shelf-mark B1455 1772 Cage); New York State Library, University of the State of New York, Albany, NY (shelf-mark B1455, 1772); Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (shelf-mark B1455, 1772); Guy W. Bailey/David W. Howe Library, University of Vermont (shelf-mark B1455, 1772); Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin (shelf-mark B1455, 1772); McGill University, copy 2 (shelf-mark B1455 1772 v.2 c.2). The editor has inspected, but not collated, additional copies of the 1772 edition from the National Library of Scotland, the British Library, and the Honnold Library, Claremont.

[3] Randall McLeod, 'Collator in a Handbag'.

[4] The variants in *EHU* were: (1) p. 17, line 7, poorly set piece of type, showing a shadowy image of an inverted L (Folger Shakespeare copy and editor's personal copy); (2) p. 56, line 6, two commas after 'principle' (McGill copy); (3) p. 102, last line, missing the catchword 'fruits' (Folger Shakespeare copy); (4) p. 127, an extra '3' at the foot of the page—a press figure (McGill copy, Chuo copy, and Bodleian copy), indicating resetting in the course of production.

addition, no cancels were discovered in a physical examination by the editor of six bound copies.

Variant readings among the several editions of *EHU*, reported here for the first time, were collected over a ten-year period by both visual collation and computer collation. Two independent, complete visual collations were performed against the copytext, and multiple complete computer collations were performed by comparing the copytext to all other editions published from 1748 to 1777. All apparent variants were verified by consulting the original printed texts, and computer files were corrected whenever mistakes of entry were detected. Using this procedure, each file of each edition was checked for accuracy at least three times after the initial collation was completed. The accuracy of the computer file of the copytext was corroborated by twenty independent computer comparisons with the corrected computer files of the other editions. After this work was completed and a full critical apparatus constructed, all texts of all editions were independently collated (for both formal and substantive variants) using the program Collate developed by Peter Robinson at the Oxford Computing Centre. All variants discovered by this method were compared against the variants produced by the previous methods, and all discrepancies eliminated after consulting the original printed texts.

Also included in this volume is an Advertisement, or notice, that Hume published late in life. This Advertisement expresses some of his views about the importance of his later works, including *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*. The Advertisement was printed in January 1776 in three formats to be placed in the unsold copies of the 1768, 1770, and 1772 editions. No copies of the versions printed for insertion in the editions of 1768 and 1772 have been discovered. The 1777 edition is the base text in the critical edition. Several copies of this edition have been collated and compared to two copies of the 1770 edition that have survived.[5]

The rationale behind the choice of copytext and the acceptance of substantive changes in the 1777 edition, as well as the methods used to convert the copytext into the critical text, are explained in the Editorial Appendix. This appendix also contains an account of editorial policy with regard to substantive emendation, choice of punctuation, correction of errors, and the like. A record of all substantive variants in editions prepared for the press by Hume is included.

All references made by Hume in his footnotes (and endnotes in the 1770–7

[5] Copy 1 is in the Liverpool University Library; copy 2 has been in a private collection held by the late A. Wayne Colver.

editions) have been checked against appropriate early modern editions of the sources and have been corrected whenever Hume or his compositor introduced errors into the citation of units such as page, book, and chapter numbers. The sources that warrant these corrections appear in the works listed in the Catalogue or in the Reference List. Occasionally Hume's numbering is correct for the editions of his day, but the numbering system is no longer standard. Whenever a conflict of numbering systems occurs, the numbering in *both* editions is cited by the editor, with the older numbering system in parentheses. All emendations to the notes are reported in the Editorial Appendix.

Editorial explanation of Hume's spare footnotes is found in the annotations. This material provides more complete information on the works cited by Hume. Precise volumes, books, chapters, sections, lines, verses, and the like have been supplied, wherever feasible.[6] No editorial intrusions appear in the text itself, but numbers are placed in the margin at the head of each paragraph and line numbers have been added, in order to establish a universal reference system that allows precise citation without use of page numbers.

[6] Many of the works cited in Hume's footnotes and in the Catalogue and Reference List vary from edition to edition in their organization and numbering, especially by comparison with 20th-century editions. These variations can be subtle and confusing. For example, Locke's numbering in his fifth and final edition of the *Essay* (the most widely reprinted edition) is different from the numbering in the fourth edition, on which the critical edition of Locke and references in the present edition of Hume are based.

ADVERTISEMENT

MOST of the principles, and reasonings, contained in this volume, were published in a work in three volumes, called *A Treatise of Human Nature*: A work which the Author had projected before he left College, and which he wrote and published not long after. But not finding it successful, he was sensible of his error in going to the press too early, and he cast the whole anew in the following pieces, where some negligences in his former reasoning and more in the expression, are, he hopes, corrected. Yet several writers, who have honoured the Author's Philosophy with answers, have taken care to direct all their batteries against that juvenile work, which the Author never acknowledged, and have affected to triumph in any advantages, which, they imagined, they had obtained over it: A practice very contrary to all rules of candour and fair-dealing, and a strong instance of those polemical artifices, which a bigotted zeal thinks itself authorized to employ. Henceforth, the Author desires, that the following Pieces may alone be regarded as containing his philosophical sentiments and principles.

AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING

SECTION 1

SBN 5

Of the Different Species of Philosophy

1 MORAL philosophy, or the science of human nature, may be treated after two different manners; each of which has its peculiar merit, and may contribute to the entertainment, instruction, and reformation of mankind. The one considers man chiefly as born for action; and as influenced in his measures by taste and sentiment; pursuing one object, and avoiding another, according to the value which these objects seem to possess, and according to the light in which they present themselves. As virtue, of all objects, is allowed to be the most valuable, this species of philosophers paint her in the most amiable colours; borrowing all helps from poetry and eloquence, and treating their subject in an easy and obvious manner, and such as is best fitted to please the imagination, and engage the affections. They select the most striking observations and instances from common life; place opposite characters in a proper contrast; and alluring us into the paths of virtue by the views of glory and happiness, direct our steps in these paths by the soundest precepts and most illustrious examples. They make us *feel* the difference between vice and virtue; they excite and regulate our sentiments; and so they can but bend our hearts to the love of probity and true honour, they think, that they have fully attained the end of all their labours.

SBN 6

2 The other species of philosophers consider man in the light of a reasonable rather than an active being, and endeavour to form his understanding more than cultivate his manners. They regard human nature as a subject of speculation; and with a narrow scrutiny examine it, in order to find those principles, which regulate our understanding, excite our sentiments, and make us approve or blame any particular object, action, or behaviour. They think it a reproach to all literature, that philosophy should not yet have fixed, beyond controversy, the foundation of morals, reasoning, and criticism; and should for ever talk of truth and falsehood, vice and virtue, beauty and deformity, without being able to determine the source of these distinctions. While they attempt this arduous task, they are deterred by no difficulties; but proceeding from particular instances to general principles, they still push on their enquiries to principles more general, and rest not satisfied till they arrive at those original principles, by which, in every science, all human curiosity must be bounded. Though their speculations seem abstract, and

even unintelligible to common readers, they aim at the approbation of the learned and the wise; and think themselves sufficiently compensated for the labour of their whole lives, if they can discover some hidden truths, which may contribute to the instruction of posterity.

3 It is certain, that the easy and obvious philosophy will always, with the generality of mankind, have the preference above the accurate and abstruse; and by many will be recommended, not only as more agreeable, but more useful than the other. It enters more into common life; moulds the heart and affections; and, by touching those principles which actuate men, reforms their conduct, and brings them nearer to that model of perfection which it describes. On the contrary, the abstruse philosophy, being founded on a turn of mind, which cannot enter into business and action, vanishes when the philosopher leaves the shade, and comes into open day; nor can its principles easily retain any influence over our conduct and behaviour. The feelings of our heart, the agitation of our passions, the vehemence of our affections, dissipate all its conclusions, and reduce the profound philosopher to a mere plebeian. *SBN 7*

4 This also must be confessed, that the most durable, as well as justest fame, has been acquired by the easy philosophy, and that abstract reasoners seem hitherto to have enjoyed only a momentary reputation, from the caprice or ignorance of their own age, but have not been able to support their renown with more equitable posterity. It is easy for a profound philosopher to commit a mistake in his subtile reasonings; and one mistake is the necessary parent of another, while he pushes on his consequences, and is not deterred from embracing any conclusion, by its unusual appearance, or its contradiction to popular opinion. But a philosopher, who purposes only to represent the common sense of mankind in more beautiful and more engaging colours, if by accident he falls into error, goes no farther; but renewing his appeal to common sense, and the natural sentiments of the mind, returns into the right path, and secures himself from any dangerous illusions. The fame of Cicero flourishes at present; but that of Aristotle is utterly decayed. La Bruyere passes the seas, and still maintains his reputation: But the glory of Malebranche is confined to his own nation, and to his own age. And Addison, perhaps, will be read with pleasure, when Locke shall be entirely forgotten.

5 The mere philosopher is a character, which is commonly but little acceptable in the world, as being supposed to contribute nothing either to the advantage or pleasure of society; while he lives remote from communication with mankind, and is wrapped up in principles and notions equally remote from their comprehension. On the other hand, the mere ignorant is still more *SBN 8*

despised; nor is any thing deemed a surer sign of an illiberal genius in an age and nation where the sciences flourish, than to be entirely destitute of all relish for those noble entertainments. The most perfect character is supposed to lie between those extremes; retaining an equal ability and taste for books, company, and business; preserving in conversation that discernment and delicacy which arise from polite letters; and in business, that probity and accuracy which are the natural result of a just philosophy. In order to diffuse and cultivate so accomplished a character, nothing can be more useful than compositions of the easy style and manner, which draw not too much from life, require no deep application or retreat to be comprehended, and send back the student among mankind full of noble sentiments and wise precepts, applicable to every exigence of human life. By means of such compositions, virtue becomes amiable, science agreeable, company instructive, and retirement entertaining.

6 Man is a reasonable being; and as such, receives from science his proper food and nourishment: But so narrow are the bounds of human understanding, that little satisfaction can be hoped for in this particular, either from the extent or security of his acquisitions. Man is a sociable, no less than a reasonable being: But neither can he always enjoy company agreeable and amusing, or preserve the proper relish for them. Man is also an active being; and from that disposition, as well as from the various necessities of human life, must submit to business and occupation: But the mind requires some relaxation, *SBN 9* and cannot always support its bent to care and industry. It seems, then, that nature has pointed out a mixed kind of life as most suitable to human race, and secretly admonished them to allow none of these biasses to *draw* too much, so as to incapacitate them for other occupations and entertainments. Indulge your passion for science, says she, but let your science be human, and such as may have a direct reference to action and society. Abstruse thought and profound researches I prohibit, and will severely punish, by the pensive melancholy which they introduce, by the endless uncertainty in which they involve you, and by the cold reception which your pretended discoveries will meet with, when communicated. Be a philosopher; but, amidst all your philosophy, be still a man.

7 Were the generality of mankind contented to prefer the easy philosophy to the abstract and profound, without throwing any blame or contempt on the latter, it might not be improper, perhaps, to comply with this general opinion, and allow every man to enjoy, without opposition, his own taste and sentiment. But as the matter is often carried farther, even to the absolute rejecting of all profound reasonings, or what is commonly called *metaphysics*, we shall now proceed to consider what can reasonably be pleaded in their behalf.

8 We may begin with observing, that one considerable advantage, which results from the accurate and abstract philosophy, is, its subserviency to the easy and humane; which, without the former, can never attain a sufficient degree of exactness in its sentiments, precepts, or reasonings. All polite letters are nothing but pictures of human life in various attitudes and situations; and inspire us with different sentiments, of praise or blame, admiration or ridicule, according to the qualities of the object, which they set before us. An artist must be better qualified to succeed in this undertaking, *SBN 10* who, besides a delicate taste and a quick apprehension, possesses an accurate knowledge of the internal fabric, the operations of the understanding, the workings of the passions, and the various species of sentiment which discriminate vice and virtue. How painful soever this inward search or enquiry may appear, it becomes, in some measure, requisite to those, who would describe with success the obvious and outward appearances of life and manners. The anatomist presents to the eye the most hideous and disagreeable objects; but his science is useful to the painter in delineating even a VENUS or an HELEN. While the latter employs all the richest colours of his art, and gives his figures the most graceful and engaging airs; he must still carry his attention to the inward structure of the human body, the position of the muscles, the fabric of the bones, and the use and figure of every part or organ. Accuracy is, in every case, advantageous to beauty, and just reasoning to delicate sentiment. In vain would we exalt the one by depreciating the other.

9 Besides, we may observe, in every art or profession, even those which most concern life or action, that a spirit of accuracy, however acquired, carries all of them nearer their perfection, and renders them more subservient to the interests of society. And though a philosopher may live remote from business, the genius of philosophy, if carefully cultivated by several, must gradually diffuse itself throughout the whole society, and bestow a similar correctness on every art and calling. The politician will acquire greater foresight and subtilty, in the subdividing and balancing of power; the lawyer more method and finer principles in his reasonings; and the general more regularity in his discipline, and more caution in his plans and operations. The stability of modern governments above the ancient, and the accuracy of modern philosophy, have improved, and probably will still improve, by similar gradations.

10 Were there no advantage to be reaped from these studies, beyond the *SBN 11* gratification of an innocent curiosity, yet ought not even this to be despised; as being one accession to those few safe and harmless pleasures, which are bestowed on human race. The sweetest and most inoffensive path of life leads

through the avenues of science and learning; and whoever can either remove any obstructions in this way, or open up any new prospect, ought so far to be esteemed a benefactor to mankind. And though these researches may appear painful and fatiguing, it is with some minds as with some bodies, which, being endowed with vigorous and florid health, require severe exercise, and reap a pleasure from what, to the generality of mankind, may seem burdensome and laborious. Obscurity, indeed, is painful to the mind as well as to the eye; but to bring light from obscurity, by whatever labour, must needs be delightful and rejoicing.

11 But this obscurity in the profound and abstract philosophy, is objected to, not only as painful and fatiguing, but as the inevitable source of uncertainty and error. Here indeed lies the justest and most plausible objection against a considerable part of metaphysics, that they are not properly a science; but arise either from the fruitless efforts of human vanity, which would penetrate into subjects utterly inaccessible to the understanding, or from the craft of popular superstitions, which, being unable to defend themselves on fair ground, raise these intangling brambles to cover and protect their weakness. Chaced from the open country, these robbers fly into the forest, and lie in wait to break in upon every unguarded avenue of the mind, and overwhelm it with religious fears and prejudices. The stoutest antagonist, if he remit his watch a moment, is oppressed. And many, through cowardice and folly, open the gates to the enemies, and willingly receive them with reverence and submission, as their legal sovereigns.

12 But is this a sufficient reason, why philosophers should desist from such researches, and leave superstition still in possession of her retreat? Is it not proper to draw an opposite conclusion, and perceive the necessity of carrying the war into the most secret recesses of the enemy? In vain do we hope, that men, from frequent disappointment, will at last abandon such airy sciences, and discover the proper province of human reason. For, besides that many persons find too sensible an interest in perpetually recalling such topics; besides this, I say, the motive of blind despair can never reasonably have place in the sciences; since, however unsuccessful former attempts may have proved, there is still room to hope, that the industry, good fortune, or improved sagacity of succeeding generations may reach discoveries unknown to former ages. Each adventurous genius will still leap at the arduous prize, and find himself stimulated, rather than discouraged, by the failures of his predecessors; while he hopes that the glory of atchieving so hard an adventure is reserved for him alone. The only method of freeing learning, at once, from these abstruse questions, is to enquire seriously into the nature of human understanding, and show, from an exact analysis of its

SBN 12

powers and capacity, that it is by no means fitted for such remote and abstruse subjects. We must submit to this fatigue, in order to live at ease ever after: And must cultivate true metaphysics with some care, in order to destroy the false and adulterate. Indolence, which, to some persons, affords a safeguard against this deceitful philosophy, is, with others, overbalanced by curiosity; and despair, which, at some moments, prevails, may give place afterwards to sanguine hopes and expectations. Accurate and just reasoning is the only catholic remedy, fitted for all persons and all dispositions; and is alone able to subvert that abstruse philosophy and metaphysical jargon, which, being mixed up with popular superstition, renders it in a manner impenetrable to careless reasoners, and gives it the air of science and wisdom. *SBN 13*

13 Besides this advantage of rejecting, after deliberate enquiry, the most uncertain and disagreeable part of learning, there are many positive advantages, which result from an accurate scrutiny into the powers and faculties of human nature. It is remarkable concerning the operations of the mind, that, though most intimately present to us, yet, whenever they become the object of reflection, they seem involved in obscurity; nor can the eye readily find those lines and boundaries, which discriminate and distinguish them. The objects are too fine to remain long in the same aspect or situation; and must be apprehended in an instant, by a superior penetration, derived from nature, and improved by habit and reflection. It becomes, therefore, no inconsiderable part of science barely to know the different operations of the mind, to separate them from each other, to class them under their proper heads, and to correct all that seeming disorder, in which they lie involved, when made the object of reflection and enquiry. This task of ordering and distinguishing, which has no merit, when performed with regard to external bodies, the objects of our senses, rises in its value, when directed towards the operations of the mind, in proportion to the difficulty and labour, which we meet with in performing it. And if we can go no farther than this mental geography, or delineation of the distinct parts and powers of the mind, it is at least a satisfaction to go so far; and the more obvious this science may appear (and it is by no means obvious) the more contemptible still must the ignorance of it be esteemed, in all pretenders to learning and philosophy.

14 Nor can there remain any suspicion, that this science is uncertain and chimerical; unless we should entertain such a scepticism as is entirely subversive of all speculation, and even action. It cannot be doubted, that the mind is endowed with several powers and faculties, that these powers are distinct from each other, that what is really distinct to the immediate perception may be distinguished by reflection; and consequently, that there is a truth and falsehood in all propositions on this subject, and a truth and falsehood, which *SBN 14*

lie not beyond the compass of human understanding. There are many obvious distinctions of this kind, such as those between the will and understanding, the imagination and passions, which fall within the comprehension of every human creature; and the finer and more philosophical distinctions are no less real and certain, though more difficult to be comprehended. Some instances, especially late ones, of success in these enquiries, may give us a juster notion of the certainty and solidity of this branch of learning. And shall we esteem it worthy the labour of a philosopher to give us a true system of the planets, and adjust the position and order of those remote bodies; while we affect to overlook those, who, with so much success, delineate the parts of the mind, in which we are so intimately concerned?

But may we not hope, that philosophy, if cultivated with care, and encouraged by the attention of the public, may carry its researches still farther, and discover, at least in some degree, the secret springs and principles, by which the human mind is actuated in its operations? Astronomers had long contented themselves with proving, from the phænomena, the true motions, order, and magnitude of the heavenly bodies: Till a philosopher, at last, arose, who seems, from the happiest reasoning, to have also determined the laws and forces, by which the revolutions of the planets are governed and directed. The like has been performed with regard to other parts of nature. And there is no reason to despair of equal success in our enquiries concerning the mental powers and œconomy, if prosecuted with equal capacity and caution. It is probable, that one operation and principle of the mind depends on *SBN 15* another; which, again, may be resolved into one more general and universal: And how far these researches may possibly be carried, it will be difficult for us, before, or even after, a careful trial, exactly to determine. This is certain, that attempts of this kind are every day made even by those who philosophize the most negligently: And nothing can be more requisite than to enter upon the enterprize with thorough care and attention; that, if it lie within the compass of human understanding, it may at last be happily atchieved; if not, it may, however, be rejected with some confidence and security. This last conclusion, surely, is not desirable; nor ought it to be embraced too rashly. For how much must we diminish from the beauty and value of this species of philosophy, upon such a supposition? Moralists have hitherto been accustomed, when they considered the vast multitude and diversity of those actions that excite our approbation or dislike, to search for some common principle, on which this variety of sentiments might depend. And though they have sometimes carried the matter too far, by their passion for some one general principle; it must, however, be confessed, that they are excusable in expecting to find some general principles, into which all the vices and virtues were justly

to be resolved. The like has been the endeavour of critics, logicians, and even politicians: Nor have their attempts been wholly unsuccessful; though perhaps longer time, greater accuracy, and more ardent application may bring these sciences still nearer their perfection. To throw up at once all pretensions of this kind may justly be deemed more rash, precipitate, and dogmatical, than even the boldest and most affirmative philosophy, that has ever attempted to impose its crude dictates and principles on mankind.

16 What though these reasonings concerning human nature seem abstract, and of difficult comprehension? This affords no presumption of their falsehood. On the contrary, it seems impossible, that what has hitherto escaped so many wise and profound philosophers can be very obvious and easy. And whatever pains these researches may cost us, we may think ourselves sufficiently rewarded, not only in point of profit but of pleasure, if, by that means, we can make any addition to our stock of knowledge, in subjects of such unspeakable importance. *SBN 16* 10

17 But as, after all, the abstractedness of these speculations is no recommendation, but rather a disadvantage to them, and as this difficulty may perhaps be surmounted by care and art, and the avoiding of all unnecessary detail, we have, in the following enquiry, attempted to throw some light upon subjects, from which uncertainty has hitherto deterred the wise, and obscurity the ignorant. Happy, if we can unite the boundaries of the different species of philosophy, by reconciling profound enquiry with clearness, and truth with novelty! And still more happy, if, reasoning in this easy manner, we can undermine the foundations of an abstruse philosophy, which seems to have hitherto served only as a shelter to superstition, and a cover to absurdity and error! 20

SECTION 2

SBN 17

Of the Origin of Ideas

1 EVERY one will readily allow, that there is a considerable difference between the perceptions of the mind, when a man feels the pain of excessive heat, or the pleasure of moderate warmth, and when he afterwards recalls to his memory this sensation, or anticipates it by his imagination. These faculties may mimic or copy the perceptions of the senses; but they never can entirely reach the force and vivacity of the original sentiment. The utmost we say of them, even when they operate with greatest vigour, is, that they represent their object in so lively a manner, that we could *almost* say we feel or see it: But, except the mind be disordered by disease or madness, they never can arrive at such a pitch of vivacity, as to render these perceptions altogether undistinguishable. All the colours of poetry, however splendid, can never paint natural objects in such a manner as to make the description be taken for a real landscape. The most lively thought is still inferior to the dullest sensation.

2 We may observe a like distinction to run through all the other perceptions of the mind. A man, in a fit of anger, is actuated in a very different manner from one who only thinks of that emotion. If you tell me, that any person is in love, I easily understand your meaning, and form a just conception of his situation; but never can mistake that conception for the real disorders and agitations of the passion. When we reflect on our past sentiments and affections, our thought is a faithful mirror, and copies its objects truly; but the colours which it employs are faint and dull, in comparison of those in which our original perceptions were clothed. It requires no nice discernment or metaphysical head to mark the distinction between them.

SBN 18

3 Here therefore we may divide all the perceptions of the mind into two classes or species, which are distinguished by their different degrees of force and vivacity. The less forcible and lively are commonly denominated THOUGHTS or IDEAS. The other species want a name in our language, and in most others; I suppose, because it was not requisite for any, but philosophical purposes, to rank them under a general term or appellation. Let us, therefore, use a little freedom, and call them IMPRESSIONS; employing that word in a sense somewhat different from the usual. By the term *impression*, then, I mean all our more lively perceptions, when we hear, or see, or feel, or love, or

hate, or desire, or will. And impressions are distinguished from ideas, which are the less lively perceptions, of which we are conscious, when we reflect on any of those sensations or movements above-mentioned.

4 Nothing, at first view, may seem more unbounded than the thought of man, which not only escapes all human power and authority, but is not even restrained within the limits of nature and reality. To form monsters, and join incongruous shapes and appearances, costs the imagination no more trouble than to conceive the most natural and familiar objects. And while the body is confined to one planet, along which it creeps with pain and difficulty; the thought can in an instant transport us into the most distant regions of the universe; or even beyond the universe, into the unbounded chaos, where nature is supposed to lie in total confusion. What never was seen, or heard of, may yet be conceived; nor is any thing beyond the power of thought, except what implies an absolute contradiction.

5 But though our thought seems to possess this unbounded liberty, we shall find, upon a nearer examination, that it is really confined within very narrow limits, and that all this creative power of the mind amounts to no more than the faculty of compounding, transposing, augmenting, or diminishing the materials afforded us by the senses and experience. When we think of a golden mountain, we only join two consistent ideas, *gold*, and *mountain*, with which we were formerly acquainted. A virtuous horse we can conceive; because, from our own feeling, we can conceive virtue; and this we may unite to the figure and shape of a horse, which is an animal familiar to us. In short, all the materials of thinking are derived either from our outward or inward sentiment: The mixture and composition of these belongs alone to the mind and will. Or, to express myself in philosophical language, all our ideas or more feeble perceptions are copies of our impressions or more lively ones. *SBN 19*

6 To prove this, the two following arguments will, I hope, be sufficient. *First*, When we analyze our thoughts or ideas, however compounded or sublime, we always find, that they resolve themselves into such simple ideas as were copied from a precedent feeling or sentiment. Even those ideas, which, at first view, seem the most wide of this origin, are found, upon a nearer scrutiny, to be derived from it. The idea of God, as meaning *an infinitely intelligent, wise, and good Being*, arises from reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and augmenting, without limit, those qualities of goodness and wisdom. We may prosecute this enquiry to what length we please; where we shall always find, that every idea which we examine is copied from a similar impression. Those who would assert, that this position is not universally true nor without exception, have only one, and that an easy method of refuting it; by producing that idea, which, in their opinion, is not derived from this

source. It will then be incumbent on us, if we would maintain our doctrine, to produce the impression or lively perception, which corresponds to it. SBN 20

7 *Secondly*, If it happen, from a defect of the organ, that a man is not susceptible of any species of sensation, we always find, that he is as little susceptible of the correspondent ideas. A blind man can form no notion of colours; a deaf man of sounds. Restore either of them that sense, in which he is deficient; by opening this new inlet for his sensations, you also open an inlet for the ideas; and he finds no difficulty in conceiving these objects. The case is the same, if the object, proper for exciting any sensation, has never been applied to the organ. A LAPLANDER or NEGROE has no notion of the relish of wine. And though there are few or no instances of a like deficiency in the mind, where a person has never felt or is wholly incapable of a sentiment or passion, that belongs to his species; yet we find the same observation to take place in a less degree. A man of mild manners can form no idea of inveterate revenge or cruelty; nor can a selfish heart easily conceive the heights of friendship and generosity. It is readily allowed, that other beings may possess many senses, of which we can have no conception; because the ideas of them have never been introduced to us, in the only manner, by which an idea can have access to the mind, to wit, by the actual feeling and sensation.

8 There is, however, one contradictory phænomenon, which may prove, that it is not absolutely impossible for ideas to arise, independent of their correspondent impressions. I believe it will readily be allowed, that the several distinct ideas of colour, which enter by the eye, or those of sound, which are conveyed by the ear, are really different from each other; though, at the same time, resembling. Now if this be true of different colours, it must be no less so of the different shades of the same colour; and each shade produces a distinct idea, independent of the rest. For if this should be denied, it is possible, by the continual gradation of shades, to run a colour insensibly into what is most remote from it; and if you will not allow any of the means to be different, you cannot, without absurdity, deny the extremes to be the same. Suppose, therefore, a person to have enjoyed his sight for thirty years, and to have become perfectly acquainted with colours of all kinds, except one particular shade of blue, for instance, which it never has been his fortune to meet with. Let all the different shades of that colour, except that single one, be placed before him, descending gradually from the deepest to the lightest; it is plain, that he will perceive a blank, where that shade is wanting, and will be sensible, that there is a greater distance in that place between the contiguous colours than in any other. Now I ask, whether it be possible for him, from his own imagination, to supply this deficiency, and raise up to himself the idea of that particular shade, though it had never been conveyed to him by his SBN 21

senses? I believe there are few but will be of opinion that he can: And this may serve as a proof, that the simple ideas are not always, in every instance, derived from the correspondent impressions; though this instance is so singular, that it is scarcely worth our observing, and does not merit, that for it alone we should alter our general maxim.

9 Here, therefore, is a proposition, which not only seems, in itself, simple and intelligible; but, if a proper use were made of it, might render every dispute equally intelligible, and banish all that jargon, which has so long taken possession of metaphysical reasonings, and drawn disgrace upon them. All ideas, especially abstract ones, are naturally faint and obscure: The mind has but a slender hold of them: They are apt to be confounded with other resembling ideas; and when we have often employed any term, though *SBN 22* without a distinct meaning, we are apt to imagine it has a determinate idea, annexed to it. On the contrary, all impressions, that is, all sensations, either outward or inward, are strong and vivid: The limits between them are more exactly determined: Nor is it easy to fall into any error or mistake with regard to them. When we entertain, therefore, any suspicion, that a philosophical term is employed without any meaning or idea (as is but too frequent), we need but enquire, *from what impression is that supposed idea derived?* And if it be impossible to assign any, this will serve to confirm our suspicion. By bringing ideas into so clear a light, we may reasonably hope to remove all dispute, which may arise, concerning their nature and reality.[1]

[1] It is probable, that no more was meant by those, who denied innate ideas, than that all ideas were *SBN 22* copies of our impressions; though it must be confessed, that the terms, which they employed, were not chosen with such caution, nor so exactly defined, as to prevent all mistakes about their doctrine. For what is meant by *innate*? If innate be equivalent to natural, then all the perceptions and ideas of the mind must be allowed to be innate or natural, in whatever sense we take the latter word, whether in opposition to what is uncommon, artificial, or miraculous. If by *innate* be meant, *cotemporary to our birth*, the dispute seems to be frivolous; nor is it worth while to enquire at what time thinking begins, whether before, at, or after our birth. Again, the word *idea*, seems to be commonly taken in a very loose sense, by LOCKE and others; as standing for any of our perceptions, our sensations and passions, as well as thoughts. Now in this sense, I should desire to know, what can be meant by asserting, that self-love, or resentment of injuries, or the passion between the sexes is not innate?

But admitting these terms, *impressions* and *ideas*, in the sense above explained, and understanding by *innate*, what is original or copied from no precedent perception, then may we assert, that all our impressions are innate, and our ideas not innate.

To be ingenuous, I must own it to be my opinion, that LOCKE was betrayed into this question by the schoolmen, who, making use of undefined terms, draw out their disputes to a tedious length, without ever touching the point in question. A like ambiguity and circumlocution seem to run through that philosopher's reasonings on this as well as most other subjects.

SECTION 3

SBN 23

Of the Association of Ideas

1 It is evident, that there is a principle of connexion between the different thoughts or ideas of the mind, and that, in their appearance to the memory or imagination, they introduce each other with a certain degree of method and regularity. In our more serious thinking or discourse, this is so observable, that any particular thought, which breaks in upon the regular tract or chain of ideas, is immediately remarked and rejected. And even in our wildest and most wandering reveries, nay in our very dreams, we shall find, if we reflect, that the imagination ran not altogether at adventures, but that there was still a connexion upheld among the different ideas, which succeeded each other. Were the loosest and freest conversation to be transcribed, there would immediately be observed something, which connected it in all its transitions. Or where this is wanting, the person, who broke the thread of discourse, might still inform you, that there had secretly revolved in his mind a succession of thought, which had gradually led him from the subject of conversation. Among different languages, even where we cannot suspect the least connexion or communication, it is found, that the words, expressive of ideas, the most compounded, do yet nearly correspond to each other: A certain proof, that the simple ideas, comprehended in the compound ones, were bound together by some universal principle, which had an equal influence on all mankind.

2 Though it be too obvious to escape observation, that different ideas are *SBN 24* connected together; I do not find, that any philosopher has attempted to enumerate or class all the principles of association; a subject, however, that seems worthy of curiosity. To me, there appear to be only three principles of connexion among ideas, namely, *Resemblance*, *Contiguity* in time or place, and *Cause* or *Effect*.

3 That these principles serve to connect ideas will not, I believe, be much doubted. A picture naturally leads our thoughts to the original:[2] The mention of one apartment in a building naturally introduces an enquiry or discourse concerning the others:[3] And if we think of a wound, we can scarcely forbear reflecting on the pain which follows it.[4] But that this

[2] Resemblance. [3] Contiguity. [4] Cause and Effect. *SBN 24*

enumeration is compleat, and that there are no other principles of association, except these, may be difficult to prove to the satisfaction of the reader, or even to a man's own satisfaction. All we can do, in such cases, is to run over several instances, and examine carefully the principle, which binds the different thoughts to each other, never stopping till we render the principle as general as possible. The more instances we examine, and the more care we employ, the more assurance shall we acquire, that the enumeration, which we form from the whole, is compleat and entire.‡ [Instead of entering into a detail of this kind, which would lead into many useless subtilties, we shall consider some of the effects of this connexion upon the passions and imagination; where we may open a field of speculation more entertaining, and perhaps more instructive, than the other.

4 As man is a reasonable being, and is continually in pursuit of happiness, which he hopes to attain by the gratification of some passion or affection, he seldom acts or speaks or thinks without a purpose and intention. He has still some object in view; and however improper the means may sometimes be, which he chooses for the attainment of his end, he never loses view of an end; nor will he so much as throw away his thoughts or reflections, where he hopes not to reap some satisfaction from them.

5 In all compositions of genius, therefore, it is requisite, that the writer have some plan or object; and though he may be hurried from this plan by the vehemence of thought, as in an ode, or drop it carelessly, as in an epistle or essay, there must appear some aim or intention, in his first setting out, if not in the composition of the whole work. A production without a design would resemble more the ravings of a madman, than the sober efforts of genius and learning.

6 As this rule admits of no exception, it follows, that, in narrative compositions, the events or actions, which the writer relates, must be connected together, by some bond or tye: They must be related to each other in the imagination, and form a kind of *Unity*, which may bring them under one plan or view, and which may be the object or end of the writer in his first undertaking.

7 This connecting principle among the several events, which form the subject of a poem or history, may be very different, according to the different designs of the poet or historian. Ovid has formed his plan upon the connecting principle of resemblance. Every fabulous transformation, produced by the miraculous power of the gods, falls within the compass of his work.

‡ The remainder of this section did not appear in the 1777 edition. The material did appear in all editions from 1748 to 1772. Ed.

There needs but this one circumstance in any event to bring it under his original plan or intention.

8 An annalist or historian, who should undertake to write the history of EUROPE during any century, would be influenced by the connexion of contiguity in time and place. All events, which happen in that portion of space and period of time, are comprehended in his design, though in other respects different and unconnected. They have still a species of unity, amidst all their diversity.

9 But the most usual species of connexion among the different events, which enter into any narrative composition, is that of cause and effect; while 10 the historian traces the series of actions according to their natural order, remounts to their secret springs and principles, and delineates their most remote consequences. He chooses for his subject a certain portion of that great chain of events, which compose the history of mankind: Each link in this chain he endeavours to touch in his narration: Sometimes unavoidable ignorance renders all his attempts fruitless: Sometimes, he supplies by conjecture, what is wanting in knowledge: And always, he is sensible, that the more unbroken the chain is, which he presents to his reader, the more perfect is his production. He sees, that the knowledge of causes is not only the most satisfactory; this relation or connexion being the strongest of all others; but 20 also the most instructive; since it is by this knowledge alone, we are enabled to controul events, and govern futurity.

10 Here therefore we may attain some notion of that *Unity* of *Action*, about which all critics, after ARISTOTLE, have talked so much: Perhaps, to little purpose, while they directed not their taste or sentiment by the accuracy of philosophy. It appears, that, in all productions, as well as in the epic and tragic, there is a certain unity required, and that, on no occasion, can our thoughts be allowed to run at adventures, if we would produce a work, which will give any lasting entertainment to mankind. It appears also, that even a biographer, who should write the life of ACHILLES, would connect the events, 30 by showing their mutual dependence and relation, as much as a poet, who should make the anger of that hero, the subject of his narration.[5] Not only in any limited portion of life, a man's actions have a dependence on each other, but also during the whole period of his duration, from the cradle to the grave; nor is it possible to strike off one link, however minute, in this regular chain, without affecting the whole series of events, which follow. The unity of action, therefore, which is to be found in biography or history, differs from

[5] Contrary to ARISTOTLE, *Μῦθος δ'ἐστὶν εἷς, οὐχ, ὥσπερ τινὲς οἴονται, ἐὰν περὶ ἑνὸς ᾖ. πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἄπειρα τῷγένει συμβαίνει, ἐξ ὧν ἐνίων οὐδέν ἐστιν ἕν. οὕτω δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἑνὸς πολλαί εἰσιν, ἐξ ὧν μία οὐδεμία γίνεται πρᾶξις, &c.* Κεφ. η′.

that of epic poetry, not in kind, but in degree. In epic poetry, the connexion among the events is more close and sensible: The narration is not carried on through such a length of time: And the actors hasten to some remarkable period, which satisfies the curiosity of the reader. This conduct of the epic poet depends on that particular situation of the *Imagination* and of the *Passions*, which is supposed in that production. The imagination, both of writer and reader, is more enlivened, and the passions more enflamed than in history, biography, or any species of narration, which confine themselves to strict truth and reality. Let us consider the effect of these two circumstances, an enlivened imagination and enflamed passion; circumstances, which belong to poetry, especially the epic kind, above any other species of composition: And let us examine the reason, why they require a stricter and closer unity in the fable.

11 *First*, All poetry, being a species of painting, brings us nearer to the objects than any other species of narration, throws a stronger light upon them, and delineates more distinctly those minute circumstances, which, though to the historian they seem superfluous, serve mightily to enliven the imagery, and gratify the fancy. If it be not necessary, as in the *Iliad*, to inform us each time the hero buckles his shoes, and ties his garters, it will be requisite, perhaps, to enter into a greater detail than in the *Henriade*; where the events are run over with such rapidity, that we scarcely have leisure to become acquainted with the scene or action. Were a poet, therefore, to comprehend in his subject, any great compass of time or series of events, and trace up the death of Hector to its remote causes, in the rape of Helen, or the judgment of Paris, he must draw out his poem to an immeasurable length, in order to fill this large canvas with just painting and imagery. The reader's imagination, enflamed with such a series of poetical descriptions, and his passions, agitated by a continual sympathy with the actors, must flag long before the period of the narration, and must sink into lassitude and disgust, from the repeated violence of the same movements.

12 *Secondly*, That an epic poet must not trace the causes to any great distance, will farther appear, if we consider another reason, which is drawn from a property of the passions still more remarkable and singular. It is evident, that, in a just composition, all the affections, excited by the different events, described and represented, add mutual force to each other; and that, while the heroes are all engaged in one common scene, and each action is strongly connected with the whole, the concern is continually awake, and the passions make an easy transition from one object to another. The strong connexion of the events, as it facilitates the passage of the thought or imagination from one to another, facilitates also the transfusion of the passions, and preserves the

affections still in the same channel and direction. Our sympathy and concern for Eve prepares the way for a like sympathy with Adam: The affection is preserved almost entire in the transition; and the mind seizes immediately the new object as strongly related to that which formerly engaged its attention. But were the poet to make a total digression from his subject, and introduce a new actor, nowise connected with the personages, the imagination, feeling a breach in the transition, would enter coldly into the new scene; would kindle by slow degrees; and in returning to the main subject of the poem, would pass, as it were, upon foreign ground, and have its concern to excite anew, in order to take part with the principal actors. The same inconvenience follows in a less degree; where the poet traces his events to too great a distance, and binds together actions, which, though not entirely disjoined, have not so strong a connexion as is requisite to forward the transition of the passions. Hence arises the artifice of the oblique narration, employed in the *Odyssey* and *Æneid*; where the hero is introduced, at first, near the period of his designs, and afterwards shows us, as it were in perspective, the more distant events and causes. By this means, the reader's curiosity is immediately excited: The events follow with rapidity, and in a very close connexion: And the concern is preserved alive, and, by means of the near relation of the objects, continually encreases, from the beginning to the end of the narration.

13 The same rule takes place in dramatic poetry; nor is it ever permitted, in a regular composition, to introduce an actor, who has no connexion, or but a small one, with the principal personages of the fable. The spectator's concern must not be diverted by any scenes disjoined and separated from the rest. This breaks the course of the passions, and prevents that communication of the several emotions, by which one scene adds force to another, and transfuses the pity and terror, which it excites, upon each succeeding scene, till the whole produces that rapidity of movement, which is peculiar to the theatre. How must it extinguish this warmth of affection, to be entertained, on a sudden, with a new action and new personages, nowise related to the former; to find so sensible a breach or vacuity in the course of the passions, by means of this breach in the connexion of ideas; and instead of carrying the sympathy of one scene into the following, to be obliged, every moment, to excite a new concern, and take part in a new scene of action?

14 To return to the comparison of history and epic poetry, we may conclude, from the foregoing reasonings, that, as a certain unity is requisite in all productions, it cannot be wanting in history more than in any other; that, in history, the connexion among the several events, which unites them into one body, is the relation of cause and effect, the same which takes place in epic

poetry; and that, in the latter composition, this connexion is only required to be closer and more sensible, on account of the lively imagination and strong passions, which must be touched by the poet in his narration. The PELOPONNESIAN war is a proper subject for history, the siege of ATHENS for an epic poem, and the death of ALCIBIADES for a tragedy.

15 As the difference, therefore, between history and epic poetry consists only in the degrees of connexion, which bind together those several events, of which their subject is composed, it will be difficult, if not impossible, by words, to determine exactly the bounds, which separate them from each other. That is a matter of taste more than of reasoning; and perhaps, this 10 unity may often be discovered in a subject, where, at first view, and from an abstract consideration, we should least expect to find it.

16 It is evident, that HOMER, in the course of his narration, exceeds the first proposition of his subject; and that the anger of ACHILLES, which caused the death of HECTOR, is not the same with that which produced so many ills to the GREEKS. But the strong connexion between these two movements, the quick transition from one to another, the contrast[6] between the effects of concord and discord among the princes, and the natural curiosity which we have to see ACHILLES in action, after so long a repose; all these causes carry on the reader, and produce a sufficient unity in the subject. 20

17 It may be objected to MILTON, that he has traced up his causes to too great a distance, and that the rebellion of the angels produces the fall of man by a train of events, which is both very long and very casual. Not to mention, that the creation of the world, which he has related at length, is no more the cause of that catastrophe, than of the battle of PHARSALIA, or any other event, that has ever happened. But if we consider, on the other hand, that all these events, the rebellion of the angels, the creation of the world, and the fall of man, *resemble* each other, in being miraculous and out of the common course of nature; that they are supposed to be *contiguous* in time; and that being detached from all other events, and being the only original facts, which reve- 30 lation discovers, they strike the eye at once, and naturally recall each other to the thought or imagination: If we consider all these circumstances, I say, we shall find, that these parts of the action have a sufficient unity to make them be comprehended in one fable or narration. To which we may add, that the rebellion of the angels and the fall of man have a peculiar resemblance, as

[6] Contrast or contrariety is a connexion among ideas, which may, perhaps, be considered as a mixture of causation and resemblance. Where two objects are contrary, the one destroys the other, i.e. is the cause of its annihilation, and the idea of the annihilation of an object implies the idea of its former existence.

being counterparts to each other, and presenting to the reader the same moral, of obedience to our Creator.

18 These loose hints I have thrown together, in order to excite the curiosity of philosophers, and beget a suspicion at least, if not a full persuasion, that this subject is very copious, and that many operations of the human mind depend on the connexion or association of ideas, which is here explained. Particularly, the sympathy between the passions and imagination will, perhaps, appear remarkable; while we observe that the affections, excited by one object, pass easily to another object connected with it; but transfuse themselves with difficulty, or not at all, along different objects, which have no 10
manner of connexion together. By introducing, into any composition, personages and actions, foreign to each other, an injudicious author loses that communication of emotions, by which alone he can interest the heart, and raise the passions to their proper height and period. The full explication of this principle and all its consequences would lead us into reasonings too profound and too copious for this enquiry. It is sufficient, at present, to have established this conclusion, that the three connecting principles of all ideas are the relations of *Resemblance*, *Contiguity*, and *Causation*.]

SECTION 4

SBN 25

Sceptical Doubts concerning the Operations of the Understanding

PART 1

1 ALL the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, *Relations of Ideas* and *Matters of Fact*. Of the first kind are the sciences of Geometry, Algebra, and Arithmetic; and in short, every affirmation, which is either intuitively or demonstratively certain. *That the square of the hypothenuse is equal to the square of the two sides*, is a proposition, which expresses a relation between these figures. *That three times five is equal to the half of thirty*, expresses a relation between these numbers. Propositions of this kind are discoverable by the mere operation of thought, without dependence on what is any where existent in the universe. Though there never were a circle or triangle in nature, the truths, demonstrated by EUCLID, would for ever retain their certainty and evidence.

2 Matters of fact, which are the second objects of human reason, are not ascertained in the same manner; nor is our evidence of their truth, however great, of a like nature with the foregoing. The contrary of every matter of fact is still possible; because it can never imply a contradiction, and is conceived by the mind with the same facility and distinctness, as if ever so conformable to reality. *That the sun will not rise to-morrow* is no less intelligible a proposition, and implies no more contradiction, than the affirmation, *that it will rise*. We should in vain, therefore, attempt to demonstrate its falsehood. Were it demonstratively false, it would imply a contradiction, and could never be distinctly conceived by the mind.

SBN 26

3 It may, therefore, be a subject worthy of curiosity, to enquire what is the nature of that evidence, which assures us of any real existence and matter of fact, beyond the present testimony of our senses, or the records of our memory. This part of philosophy, it is observable, has been little cultivated, either by the ancients or moderns; and therefore our doubts and errors, in the prosecution of so important an enquiry, may be the more excusable; while we march through such difficult paths, without any guide or direction. They may even prove useful, by exciting curiosity, and destroying that implicit faith and security, which is the bane of all reasoning and free enquiry. The

discovery of defects in the common philosophy, if any such there be, will not, I presume, be a discouragement, but rather an incitement, as is usual, to attempt something more full and satisfactory, than has yet been proposed to the public.

4 All reasonings concerning matter of fact seem to be founded on the relation of *Cause* and *Effect*. By means of that relation alone we can go beyond the evidence of our memory and senses. If you were to ask a man, why he believes any matter of fact, which is absent; for instance, that his friend is in the country, or in FRANCE; he would give you a reason; and this reason would be some other fact; as a letter received from him, or the knowledge of his former resolutions and promises. A man, finding a watch or any other machine in a desert island, would conclude, that there had once been men in that island. All our reasonings concerning fact are of the same nature. And here it is *SBN 27* constantly supposed, that there is a connexion between the present fact and that which is inferred from it. Were there nothing to bind them together, the inference would be entirely precarious. The hearing of an articulate voice and rational discourse in the dark assures us of the presence of some person: Why? Because these are the effects of the human make and fabric, and closely connected with it. If we anatomize all the other reasonings of this nature, we shall find, that they are founded on the relation of cause and effect, and that this relation is either near or remote, direct or collateral. Heat and light are collateral effects of fire, and the one effect may justly be inferred from the other.

5 If we would satisfy ourselves, therefore, concerning the nature of that evidence, which assures us of matters of fact, we must enquire how we arrive at the knowledge of cause and effect.

6 I shall venture to affirm, as a general proposition, which admits of no exception, that the knowledge of this relation is not, in any instance, attained by reasonings *a priori*; but arises entirely from experience, when we find, that any particular objects are constantly conjoined with each other. Let an object be presented to a man of ever so strong natural reason and abilities; if that object be entirely new to him, he will not be able, by the most accurate examination of its sensible qualities, to discover any of its causes or effects. ADAM, though his rational faculties be supposed, at the very first, entirely perfect, could not have inferred from the fluidity and transparency of water, that it would suffocate him, or from the light and warmth of fire, that it would consume him. No object ever discovers, by the qualities which appear to the senses, either the causes, which produced it, or the effects, which will arise from it; nor can our reason, unassisted by experience, ever draw any inference concerning real existence and matter of fact.

7 This proposition, *that causes and effects are discoverable, not by reason, but by experience*, will readily be admitted with regard to such objects, as we remember to have once been altogether unknown to us; since we must be conscious of the utter inability, which we then lay under, of foretelling, what would arise from them. Present two smooth pieces of marble to a man, who has no tincture of natural philosophy; he will never discover, that they will adhere together, in such a manner as to require great force to separate them in a direct line, while they make so small a resistance to a lateral pressure. Such events, as bear little analogy to the common course of nature, are also readily confessed to be known only by experience; nor does any man imagine that the explosion of gunpowder, or the attraction of a loadstone, could ever be discovered by arguments *a priori*. In like manner, when an effect is supposed to depend upon an intricate machinery or secret structure of parts, we make no difficulty in attributing all our knowledge of it to experience. Who will assert, that he can give the ultimate reason, why milk or bread is proper nourishment for a man, not for a lion or a tyger? *SBN 28*

8 But the same truth may not appear, at first sight, to have the same evidence with regard to events, which have become familiar to us from our first appearance in the world, which bear a close analogy to the whole course of nature, and which are supposed to depend on the simple qualities of objects, without any secret structure of parts. We are apt to imagine, that we could discover these effects by the mere operation of our reason, without experience. We fancy, that were we brought, on a sudden, into this world, we could at first have inferred, that one billiard-ball would communicate motion to another upon impulse; and that we needed not to have waited for the event, in order to pronounce with certainty concerning it. Such is the influence of custom, that, where it is strongest, it not only covers our natural ignorance, but even conceals itself, and seems not to take place, merely because it is found in the highest degree. *SBN 29*

9 But to convince us, that all the laws of nature, and all the operations of bodies without exception, are known only by experience, the following reflections may, perhaps, suffice. Were any object presented to us, and were we required to pronounce concerning the effect, which will result from it, without consulting past observation; after what manner, I beseech you, must the mind proceed in this operation? It must invent or imagine some event, which it ascribes to the object as its effect; and it is plain that this invention must be entirely arbitrary. The mind can never possibly find the effect in the supposed cause, by the most accurate scrutiny and examination. For the effect is totally different from the cause, and consequently can never be discovered in it. Motion in the second billiard-ball is a quite distinct event from

motion in the first; nor is there any thing in the one to suggest the smallest hint of the other. A stone or piece of metal raised into the air, and left without any support, immediately falls: But to consider the matter *a priori*, is there any thing we discover in this situation, which can beget the idea of a downward, rather than an upward, or any other motion, in the stone or metal?

10 And as the first imagination or invention of a particular effect, in all natural operations, is arbitrary, where we consult not experience; so must we also esteem the supposed tye or connexion between the cause and effect, which binds them together, and renders it impossible, that any other effect could result from the operation of that cause. When I see, for instance, a 10 billiard-ball moving in a straight line towards another; even suppose motion in the second ball should by accident be suggested to me, as the result of their contact or impulse; may I not conceive, that a hundred different events might as well follow from that cause? May not both these balls remain at absolute rest? May not the first ball return in a straight line, or leap off from the second *SBN 30* in any line or direction? All these suppositions are consistent and conceivable. Why then should we give the preference to one, which is no more consistent or conceivable than the rest? All our reasonings *a priori* will never be able to show us any foundation for this preference.

11 In a word, then, every effect is a distinct event from its cause. It could not, 20 therefore, be discovered in the cause, and the first invention or conception of it, *a priori*, must be entirely arbitrary. And even after it is suggested, the conjunction of it with the cause must appear equally arbitrary; since there are always many other effects, which, to reason, must seem fully as consistent and natural. In vain, therefore, should we pretend to determine any single event, or infer any cause or effect, without the assistance of observation and experience.

12 Hence we may discover the reason, why no philosopher, who is rational and modest, has ever pretended to assign the ultimate cause of any natural operation, or to show distinctly the action of that power, which produces any 30 single effect in the universe. It is confessed, that the utmost effort of human reason is, to reduce the principles, productive of natural phænomena, to a greater simplicity, and to resolve the many particular effects into a few general causes, by means of reasonings from analogy, experience, and observation. But as to the causes of these general causes, we should in vain attempt their discovery; nor shall we ever be able to satisfy ourselves, by any particular explication of them. These ultimate springs and principles are totally shut up from human curiosity and enquiry. Elasticity, gravity, cohesion of parts, communication of motion by impulse; these are probably the ultimate causes and principles which we shall ever discover in nature; and we may esteem 40

ourselves sufficiently happy, if, by accurate enquiry and reasoning, we can trace up the particular phænomena to, or near to, these general principles. *SBN 31*
The most perfect philosophy of the natural kind only staves off our ignorance a little longer: As perhaps the most perfect philosophy of the moral or metaphysical kind serves only to discover larger portions of our ignorance. Thus the observation of human blindness and weakness is the result of all philosophy, and meets us, at every turn, in spite of our endeavours to elude or avoid it.

13 Nor is geometry, when taken into the assistance of natural philosophy, ever able to remedy this defect, or lead us into the knowledge of ultimate causes, 10
by all that accuracy of reasoning, for which it is so justly celebrated. Every part of mixed mathematics proceeds upon the supposition, that certain laws are established by nature in her operations; and abstract reasonings are employed, either to assist experience in the discovery of these laws, or to determine their influence in particular instances, where it depends upon any precise degree of distance and quantity. Thus, it is a law of motion, discovered by experience, that the moment or force of any body in motion is in the compound ratio or proportion of its solid contents and its velocity; and consequently, that a small force may remove the greatest obstacle or raise the greatest weight, if, by any contrivance or machinery, we can encrease the 20
velocity of that force, so as to make it an overmatch for its antagonist. Geometry assists us in the application of this law, by giving us the just dimensions of all the parts and figures, which can enter into any species of machine; but still the discovery of the law itself is owing merely to experience, and all the abstract reasonings in the world could never lead us one step towards the knowledge of it. When we reason *a priori*, and consider merely any object or cause, as it appears to the mind, independent of all observation, it never could suggest to us the notion of any distinct object, such as its effect; much less, show us the inseparable and inviolable connexion between them. A man must be very sagacious, who could discover by reasoning, that crystal is the *SBN 32*
effect of heat, and ice of cold, without being previously acquainted with the operations of these qualities.

PART 2

14 But we have not, as yet, attained any tolerable satisfaction with regard to the question first proposed. Each solution still gives rise to a new question as difficult as the foregoing, and leads us on to farther enquiries. When it is asked, *What is the nature of all our reasonings concerning matter of fact?* the proper

answer seems to be, that they are founded on the relation of cause and effect. When again it is asked, *What is the foundation of all our reasonings and conclusions concerning that relation?* it may be replied in one word, EXPERIENCE. But if we still carry on our sifting humour, and ask, *What is the foundation of all conclusions from experience?* this implies a new question, which may be of more difficult solution and explication. Philosophers, that give themselves airs of superior wisdom and sufficiency, have a hard task, when they encounter persons of inquisitive dispositions, who push them from every corner, to which they retreat, and who are sure at last to bring them to some dangerous dilemma. The best expedient to prevent this confusion, is to be modest in our pretensions; and even to discover the difficulty ourselves before it is objected to us. By this means, we may make a kind of merit of our very ignorance.

I shall content myself, in this section, with an easy task, and shall pretend only to give a negative answer to the question here proposed. I say then, that, even after we have experience of the operations of cause and effect, our conclusions from that experience are *not* founded on reasoning, or any process of the understanding. This answer we must endeavour, both to explain and to defend.

It must certainly be allowed, that nature has kept us at a great distance from all her secrets, and has afforded us only the knowledge of a few superficial qualities of objects; while she conceals from us those powers and principles, on which the influence of these objects entirely depends. Our senses inform us of the colour, weight, and consistence of bread; but neither sense nor reason can ever inform us of those qualities, which fit it for the nourishment and support of a human body. Sight or feeling conveys an idea of the actual motion of bodies; but as to that wonderful force or power, which would carry on a moving body for ever in a continued change of place, and which bodies never lose but by communicating it to others; of this we cannot form the most distant conception. But notwithstanding this ignorance of natural powers[7] and principles, we always presume, when we see like sensible qualities, that they have like secret powers, and expect, that effects, similar to those, which we have experienced, will follow from them. If a body of like colour and consistence with that bread, which we have formerly eat, be presented to us, we make no scruple of repeating the experiment, and foresee, with certainty, like nourishment and support. Now this is a process of the mind or thought, of which I would willingly know the foundation. It is

[7] The word, *power*, is here used in a loose and popular sense. The more accurate explication of it would give additional evidence to this argument. See Section 7.

allowed on all hands, that there is no known connexion between the sensible qualities and the secret powers; and consequently, that the mind is not led to form such a conclusion concerning their constant and regular conjunction, by any thing which it knows of their nature. As to past *Experience*, it can be allowed to give *direct* and *certain* information of those precise objects only, and that precise period of time, which fell under its cognizance: But why this experience should be extended to future times, and to other objects, which, for aught we know, may be only in appearance similar; this is the main question on which I would insist. The bread, which I formerly eat, nourished me; that is, a body of such sensible qualities, was, at that time, endowed with such secret powers: But does it follow, that other bread must also nourish me at another time, and that like sensible qualities must always be attended with like secret powers? The consequence seems nowise necessary. At least, it must be acknowledged, that there is here a consequence drawn by the mind; that there is a certain step taken; a process of thought, and an inference, which wants to be explained. These two propositions are far from being the same, *I have found that such an object has always been attended with such an effect*, and *I foresee, that other objects, which are, in appearance, similar, will be attended with similar effects*. I shall allow, if you please, that the one proposition may justly be inferred from the other: I know in fact, that it always is inferred. But if you insist, that the inference is made by a chain of reasoning, I desire you to produce that reasoning. The connexion between these propositions is not intuitive. There is required a medium, which may enable the mind to draw such an inference, if indeed it be drawn by reasoning and argument. What that medium is, I must confess, passes my comprehension; and it is incumbent on those to produce it, who assert, that it really exists, and is the origin of all our conclusions concerning matter of fact. *SBN 34*

17 This negative argument must certainly, in process of time, become altogether convincing, if many penetrating and able philosophers shall turn their enquiries this way; and no one be ever able to discover any connecting proposition or intermediate step, which supports the understanding in this conclusion. But as the question is yet new, every reader may not trust so far to his own penetration, as to conclude, because an argument escapes his enquiry, that therefore it does not really exist. For this reason it may be requisite to venture upon a more difficult task; and enumerating all the branches of human knowledge, endeavour to show, that none of them can afford such an argument. *SBN 35*

18 All reasonings may be divided into two kinds, namely, demonstrative reasoning, or that concerning relations of ideas, and moral reasoning, or that concerning matter of fact and existence. That there are no demonstrative

arguments in the case, seems evident; since it implies no contradiction, that the course of nature may change, and that an object, seemingly like those which we have experienced, may be attended with different or contrary effects. May I not clearly and distinctly conceive, that a body, falling from the clouds, and which, in all other respects, resembles snow, has yet the taste of salt or feeling of fire? Is there any more intelligible proposition than to affirm, that all the trees will flourish in DECEMBER and JANUARY, and decay in MAY and JUNE? Now whatever is intelligible, and can be distinctly conceived, implies no contradiction, and can never be proved false by any demonstrative argument or abstract reasoning *a priori*.

19 If we be, therefore, engaged by arguments to put trust in past experience, and make it the standard of our future judgment, these arguments must be probable only, or such as regard matter of fact and real existence, according to the division above-mentioned. But that there is no argument of this kind, must appear, if our explication of that species of reasoning be admitted as solid and satisfactory. We have said, that all arguments concerning existence are founded on the relation of cause and effect; that our knowledge of that relation is derived entirely from experience; and that all our experimental conclusions proceed upon the supposition, that the future will be conformable to the past. To endeavour, therefore, the proof of this last supposition by probable arguments, or arguments regarding existence, must be *SBN 36* evidently going in a circle, and taking that for granted, which is the very point in question.

20 In reality, all arguments from experience are founded on the similarity, which we discover among natural objects, and by which we are induced to expect effects similar to those, which we have found to follow from such objects. And though none but a fool or madman will ever pretend to dispute the authority of experience, or to reject that great guide of human life; it may surely be allowed a philosopher to have so much curiosity at least, as to examine the principle of human nature, which gives this mighty authority to experience, and makes us draw advantage from that similarity, which nature has placed among different objects. From causes, which appear *similar*, we expect similar effects. This is the sum of all our experimental conclusions. Now it seems evident, that, if this conclusion were formed by reason, it would be as perfect at first, and upon one instance, as after ever so long a course of experience. But the case is far otherwise. Nothing so like as eggs; yet no one, on account of this appearing similarity, expects the same taste and relish in all of them. It is only after a long course of uniform experiments in any kind, that we attain a firm reliance and security with regard to a particular event. Now where is that process of reasoning, which, from one instance,

draws a conclusion, so different from that which it infers from a hundred instances, that are nowise different from that single one? This question I propose as much for the sake of information, as with an intention of raising difficulties. I cannot find, I cannot imagine any such reasoning. But I keep my mind still open to instruction, if any one will vouchsafe to bestow it on me.

21 Should it be said, that, from a number of uniform experiments, we *infer* a connexion between the sensible qualities and the secret powers; this, I must confess, seems the same difficulty, couched in different terms. The question *SBN 37* still recurs, On what process of argument this *inference* is founded? Where is the medium, the interposing ideas, which join propositions so very wide of 10 each other? It is confessed, that the colour, consistence, and other sensible qualities of bread appear not, of themselves, to have any connexion with the secret powers of nourishment and support. For otherwise we could infer these secret powers from the first appearance of these sensible qualities, without the aid of experience; contrary to the sentiment of all philosophers, and contrary to plain matter of fact. Here then is our natural state of ignorance with regard to the powers and influence of all objects. How is this remedied by experience? It only shows us a number of uniform effects, resulting from certain objects, and teaches us, that those particular objects, at that particular time, were endowed with such powers and forces. When a new object, 20 endowed with similar sensible qualities, is produced, we expect similar powers and forces, and look for a like effect. From a body of like colour and consistence with bread, we expect like nourishment and support. But this surely is a step or progress of the mind, which wants to be explained. When a man says, *I have found, in all past instances, such sensible qualities conjoined with such secret powers*: And when he says, *similar sensible qualities will always be conjoined with similar secret powers*; he is not guilty of a tautology, nor are these propositions in any respect the same. You say that the one proposition is an inference from the other. But you must confess, that the inference is not intuitive; neither is it demonstrative: Of what nature is it then? To say it is 30 experimental, is begging the question. For all inferences from experience suppose, as their foundation, that the future will resemble the past, and that similar powers will be conjoined with similar sensible qualities. If there be any suspicion, that the course of nature may change, and that the past may be *SBN 38* no rule for the future, all experience becomes useless, and can give rise to no inference or conclusion. It is impossible, therefore, that any arguments from experience can prove this resemblance of the past to the future; since all these arguments are founded on the supposition of that resemblance. Let the course of things be allowed hitherto ever so regular; that alone, without some new argument or inference, proves not, that, for the future, it will continue 40

so. In vain do you pretend to have learned the nature of bodies from your past experience. Their secret nature, and consequently, all their effects and influence, may change, without any change in their sensible qualities. This happens sometimes, and with regard to some objects: Why may it not happen always, and with regard to all objects? What logic, what process of argument secures you against this supposition? My practice, you say, refutes my doubts. But you mistake the purport of my question. As an agent, I am quite satisfied in the point; but as a philosopher, who has some share of curiosity, I will not say scepticism, I want to learn the foundation of this inference. No reading, no enquiry has yet been able to remove my difficulty, or give me satisfaction in a matter of such importance. Can I do better than propose the difficulty to the public, even though, perhaps, I have small hopes of obtaining a solution? We shall at least, by this means, be sensible of our ignorance, if we do not augment our knowledge.

22 I must confess, that a man is guilty of unpardonable arrogance, who concludes, because an argument has escaped his own investigation, that therefore it does not really exist. I must also confess, that, though all the learned, for several ages, should have employed themselves in fruitless search upon any subject, it may still, perhaps, be rash to conclude positively, that the subject must, therefore, pass all human comprehension. Even though we examine all the sources of our knowledge, and conclude them unfit for such a subject, there may still remain a suspicion, that the enumeration is not compleat, or the examination not accurate. But with regard to the present subject, there are some considerations, which seem to remove all this accusation of arrogance or suspicion of mistake. *SBN 39*

23 It is certain, that the most ignorant and stupid peasants, nay infants, nay even brute beasts, improve by experience, and learn the qualities of natural objects, by observing the effects, which result from them. When a child has felt the sensation of pain from touching the flame of a candle, he will be careful not to put his hand near any candle; but will expect a similar effect from a cause, which is similar in its sensible qualities and appearance. If you assert, therefore, that the understanding of the child is led into this conclusion by any process of argument or ratiocination, I may justly require you to produce that argument; nor have you any pretence to refuse so equitable a demand. You cannot say, that the argument is abstruse, and may possibly escape your enquiry; since you confess, that it is obvious to the capacity of a mere infant. If you hesitate, therefore, a moment, or if, after reflection, you produce any intricate or profound argument, you, in a manner, give up the question, and confess, that it is not reasoning which engages us to suppose the past resembling the future, and to expect similar effects from causes,

which are, to appearance, similar. This is the proposition which I intended to enforce in the present section. If I be right, I pretend not to have made any mighty discovery. And if I be wrong, I must acknowledge myself to be indeed a very backward scholar; since I cannot now discover an argument, which, it seems, was perfectly familiar to me, long before I was out of my cradle.

SECTION 5

SBN 40

Sceptical Solution of these Doubts

PART 1

1 THE passion for philosophy, like that for religion, seems liable to this inconvenience, that, though it aims at the correction of our manners, and extirpation of our vices, it may only serve, by imprudent management, to foster a predominant inclination, and push the mind, with more determined resolution, towards that side, which already *draws* too much, by the biass and propensity of the natural temper. It is certain, that, while we aspire to the magnanimous firmness of the philosophic sage, and endeavour to confine our pleasures altogether within our own minds, we may, at last, render our philosophy like that of EPICTETUS, and other STOICS, only a more refined system of selfishness, and reason ourselves out of all virtue, as well as social enjoyment. While we study with attention the vanity of human life, and turn all our thoughts towards the empty and transitory nature of riches and honours, we are, perhaps, all the while, flattering our natural indolence, which, hating the bustle of the world, and drudgery of business, seeks a pretence of reason, to give itself a full and uncontrouled indulgence. There is, however, one species of philosophy, which seems little liable to this inconvenience, and that because it strikes in with no disorderly passion of the human mind, nor can mingle itself with any natural affection or propensity; and that is the ACADEMIC or SCEPTICAL philosophy. The ACADEMICS always talk of doubt and suspence of judgment, of danger in hasty determinations, of confining to very narrow bounds the enquiries of the understanding, and of renouncing all speculations which lie not within the limits of common life and practice. Nothing, therefore, can be more contrary than such a philosophy to the supine indolence of the mind, its rash arrogance, its lofty pretensions, and its superstitious credulity. Every passion is mortified by it, except the love of truth; and that passion never is, nor can be carried to too high a degree. It is surprizing, therefore, that this philosophy, which, in almost every instance, must be harmless and innocent, should be the subject of so much groundless reproach and obloquy. But, perhaps, the very circumstance, which renders it so innocent, is what chiefly exposes it to the public hatred and resentment. By flattering no irregular passion, it gains few partizans: By opposing so many

SBN 41

vices and follies, it raises to itself abundance of enemies, who stigmatize it as libertine, profane, and irreligious.

2 Nor need we fear, that this philosophy, while it endeavours to limit our enquiries to common life, should ever undermine the reasonings of common life, and carry its doubts so far as to destroy all action, as well as speculation. Nature will always maintain her rights, and prevail in the end over any abstract reasoning whatsoever. Though we should conclude, for instance, as in the foregoing section, that, in all reasonings from experience, there is a step taken by the mind, which is not supported by any argument or process of the understanding; there is no danger, that these reasonings, on which almost all knowledge depends, will ever be affected by such a discovery. If the mind be not engaged by argument to make this step, it must be induced by some other principle of equal weight and authority; and that principle will preserve its influence as long as human nature remains the same. What that principle is, *SBN 42* may well be worth the pains of enquiry.

3 Suppose a person, though endowed with the strongest faculties of reason and reflection, to be brought on a sudden into this world; he would, indeed, immediately observe a continual succession of objects, and one event following another; but he would not be able to discover any thing farther. He would not, at first, by any reasoning, be able to reach the idea of cause and effect; since the particular powers, by which all natural operations are performed, never appear to the senses; nor is it reasonable to conclude, merely because one event, in one instance, precedes another, that therefore the one is the cause, the other the effect. Their conjunction may be arbitrary and casual. There may be no reason to infer the existence of one from the appearance of the other. And in a word, such a person, without more experience, could never employ his conjecture or reasoning concerning any matter of fact, or be assured of any thing beyond what was immediately present to his memory and senses.

4 Suppose again, that he has acquired more experience, and has lived so long in the world as to have observed similar objects or events to be constantly conjoined together; what is the consequence of this experience? He immediately infers the existence of one object from the appearance of the other. Yet he has not, by all his experience, acquired any idea or knowledge of the secret power, by which the one object produces the other; nor is it, by any process of reasoning, he is engaged to draw this inference. But still he finds himself determined to draw it: And though he should be convinced, that his understanding has no part in the operation, he would nevertheless continue in the same course of thinking. There is some other principle, which determines him to form such a conclusion.

This principle is CUSTOM or HABIT. For wherever the repetition of any *SBN 43*
particular act or operation produces a propensity to renew the same act
or operation, without being impelled by any reasoning or process of the
understanding; we always say, that this propensity is the effect of *Custom*. By
employing that word, we pretend not to have given the ultimate reason of
such a propensity. We only point out a principle of human nature, which is
universally acknowledged, and which is well known by its effects. Perhaps,
we can push our enquiries no farther, or pretend to give the cause of this
cause; but must rest contented with it as the ultimate principle, which we can
assign, of all our conclusions from experience. It is sufficient satisfaction,
that we can go so far; without repining at the narrowness of our faculties,
because they will carry us no farther. And it is certain we here advance a very
intelligible proposition at least, if not a true one, when we assert, that, after
the constant conjunction of two objects, heat and flame, for instance, weight
and solidity, we are determined by custom alone to expect the one from the
appearance of the other. This hypothesis seems even the only one, which
explains the difficulty, why we draw, from a thousand instances, an inference,
which we are not able to draw from one instance, that is, in no respect, differ-
ent from them. Reason is incapable of any such variation. The conclusions,
which it draws from considering one circle, are the same which it would form
upon surveying all the circles in the universe. But no man, having seen only
one body move after being impelled by another, could infer, that every other
body will move after a like impulse. All inferences from experience, therefore,
are effects of custom, not of reasoning.[8]

[8] Nothing is more usual than for writers, even on *moral*, *political*, or *physical* subjects, to distin- *SBN 43*
guish between *reason* and *experience*, and to suppose, that these species of argumentation are entirely
different from each other. The former are taken for the mere result of our intellectual faculties, *SBN 44*
which, by considering *a priori* the nature of things, and examining the effects, that must follow from
their operation, establish particular principles of science and philosophy. The latter are supposed to
be derived entirely from sense and observation, by which we learn what has actually resulted from
the operation of particular objects, and are thence able to infer, what will, for the future, result from
them. Thus, for instance, the limitations and restraints of civil government, and a legal constitu-
tion, may be defended, either from *reason*, which, reflecting on the great frailty and corruption of
human nature, teaches, that no man can safely be trusted with unlimited authority; or from *experi-*
ence and history, which inform us of the enormous abuses, that ambition, in every age and country,
has been found to make of so imprudent a confidence.

The same distinction between reason and experience is maintained in all our deliberations
concerning the conduct of life; while the experienced statesman, general, physician, or merchant
is trusted and followed; and the unpractised novice, with whatever natural talents endowed,
neglected, and despised. Though it be allowed, that reason may form very plausible conjectures
with regard to the consequences of such a particular conduct in such particular circumstances; it is
still supposed imperfect, without the assistance of experience, which is alone able to give stability
and certainty to the maxims, derived from study and reflection.

But notwithstanding that this distinction be thus universally received, both in the active and
speculative scenes of life, I shall not scruple to pronounce, that it is, at bottom, erroneous, or at least,
superficial.

If we examine those arguments, which, in any of the sciences above-mentioned, are supposed to

6 Custom, then, is the great guide of human life. It is that principle alone, *SBN 44*
which renders our experience useful to us, and makes us expect, for the future, a similar train of events with those which have appeared in the past. Without the influence of custom, we should be entirely ignorant of every *SBN 45*
matter of fact, beyond what is immediately present to the memory and senses. We should never know how to adjust means to ends, or to employ our natural powers in the production of any effect. There would be an end at once of all action, as well as of the chief part of speculation.

7 But here it may be proper to remark, that though our conclusions from experience carry us beyond our memory and senses, and assure us of matters of fact, which happened in the most distant places and most remote ages; yet some fact must always be present to the senses or memory, from which we may first proceed in drawing these conclusions. A man, who should find in a desert country the remains of pompous buildings, would conclude, that the country had, in ancient times, been cultivated by civilized inhabitants; but did nothing of this nature occur to him, he could never form such an infer- *SBN 46*
ence. We learn the events of former ages from history; but then we must peruse the volumes, in which this instruction is contained, and thence carry up our inferences from one testimony to another, till we arrive at the eye-witnesses and spectators of these distant events. In a word, if we proceed not upon some fact, present to the memory or senses, our reasonings would be merely hypothetical; and however the particular links might be connected

be the mere effects of reasoning and reflection, they will be found to terminate, at last, in some general principle or conclusion, for which we can assign no reason but observation and experience. The only difference between them and those maxims, which are vulgarly esteemed the result of pure experience, is, that the former cannot be established without some process of thought, and some reflection on what we have observed, in order to distinguish its circumstances, and trace its consequences: Whereas in the latter, the experienced event is exactly and fully similar to that which we infer as the result of any particular situation. The history of a TIBERIUS or a NERO makes us dread a like tyranny, were our monarchs freed from the restraints of laws and senates: But the observation of any fraud or cruelty in private life is sufficient, with the aid of a little thought, to give us the same *SBN 45*
apprehension; while it serves as an instance of the general corruption of human nature, and shows us the danger which we must incur by reposing an entire confidence in mankind. In both cases, it is experience which is ultimately the foundation of our inference and conclusion.

There is no man so young and unexperienced, as not to have formed, from observation, many general and just maxims concerning human affairs and the conduct of life; but it must be confessed, that, when a man comes to put these in practice, he will be extremely liable to error, till time and farther experience both enlarge these maxims, and teach him their proper use and application. In every situation or incident, there are many particular and seemingly minute circumstances, which the man of greatest talents is, at first, apt to overlook, though on them the justness of his conclusions, and consequently the prudence of his conduct, entirely depend. Not to mention, that, to a young beginner, the general observations and maxims occur not always on the proper occasions, nor can be immediately applied with due calmness and distinction. The truth is, an unexperienced reasoner could be no reasoner at all, were he absolutely unexperienced; and when we assign that character to any one, we mean it only in a comparative sense, and suppose him possessed of experience, in a smaller and more imperfect degree.

with each other, the whole chain of inferences would have nothing to support it, nor could we ever, by its means, arrive at the knowledge of any real existence. If I ask, why you believe any particular matter of fact, which you relate, you must tell me some reason; and this reason will be some other fact, connected with it. But as you cannot proceed after this manner, *in infinitum*, you must at last terminate in some fact, which is present to your memory or senses; or must allow that your belief is entirely without foundation.

8 What then is the conclusion of the whole matter? A simple one; though, it must be confessed, pretty remote from the common theories of philosophy. All belief of matter of fact or real existence is derived merely from some object, present to the memory or senses, and a customary conjunction between that and some other object. Or in other words; having found, in many instances, that any two kinds of objects, flame and heat, snow and cold, have always been conjoined together; if flame or snow be presented anew to the senses, the mind is carried by custom to expect heat or cold, and to *believe*, that such a quality does exist, and will discover itself upon a nearer approach. This belief is the necessary result of placing the mind in such circumstances. It is an operation of the soul, when we are so situated, as unavoidable as to feel the passion of love, when we receive benefits; or hatred, when we meet with injuries. All these operations are a species of natural instincts, which no reasoning or process of the thought and understanding is able, either to produce, or to prevent. *SBN 47*

9 At this point, it would be very allowable for us to stop our philosophical researches. In most questions, we can never make a single step farther; and in all questions, we must terminate here at last, after our most restless and curious enquiries. But still our curiosity will be pardonable, perhaps commendable, if it carry us on to still farther researches, and make us examine more accurately the nature of this *belief*, and of the *customary conjunction*, whence it is derived. By this means we may meet with some explications and analogies, that will give satisfaction; at least to such as love the abstract sciences, and can be entertained with speculations, which, however accurate, may still retain a degree of doubt and uncertainty. As to readers of a different taste; the remaining part of this section is not calculated for them, and the following enquiries may well be understood, though it be neglected.

PART 2

10 Nothing is more free than the imagination of man; and though it cannot exceed that original stock of ideas, furnished by the internal and external senses, it has unlimited power of mixing, compounding, separating, and

dividing these ideas, in all the varieties of fiction and vision. It can feign a train of events, with all the appearance of reality, ascribe to them a particular time and place, conceive them as existent, and paint them out to itself with every circumstance, that belongs to any historical fact, which it believes with the greatest certainty. Wherein, therefore, consists the difference between such a fiction and belief? It lies not merely in any peculiar idea, which is annexed to such a conception as commands our assent, and which is wanting to every known fiction. For as the mind has authority over all its *SBN 48*
ideas, it could voluntarily annex this particular idea to any fiction, and consequently be able to believe whatever it pleases; contrary to what we find by 10
daily experience. We can, in our conception, join the head of a man to the body of a horse; but it is not in our power to believe, that such an animal has ever really existed.

11 It follows, therefore, that the difference between *fiction* and *belief* lies in some sentiment or feeling, which is annexed to the latter, not to the former, and which depends not on the will, nor can be commanded at pleasure. It must be excited by nature, like all other sentiments; and must arise from the particular situation, in which the mind is placed at any particular juncture. Whenever any object is presented to the memory or senses, it immediately, by the force of custom, carries the imagination to conceive that 20
object, which is usually conjoined to it; and this conception is attended with a feeling or sentiment, different from the loose reveries of the fancy. In this consists the whole nature of belief. For as there is no matter of fact which we believe so firmly, that we cannot conceive the contrary, there would be no difference between the conception assented to, and that which is rejected, were it not for some sentiment, which distinguishes the one from the other. If I see a billiard-ball moving towards another, on a smooth table, I can easily conceive it to stop upon contact. This conception implies no contradiction; but still it feels very differently from that conception, by which I represent to myself the impulse, and the communication of motion from one ball to 30
another.

12 Were we to attempt a *definition* of this sentiment, we should, perhaps, find it a very difficult, if not an impossible task; in the same manner as if we should endeavour to define the feeling of cold or passion of anger, to a creature who never had any experience of these sentiments. *Belief* is the true and *SBN 49*
proper name of this feeling; and no one is ever at a loss to know the meaning of that term; because every man is every moment conscious of the sentiment represented by it. It may not, however, be improper to attempt a *description* of this sentiment; in hopes we may, by that means, arrive at some analogies, which may afford a more perfect explication of it. I say then, that belief 40

is nothing but a more vivid, lively, forcible, firm, steady conception of an object, than what the imagination alone is ever able to attain. This variety of terms, which may seem so unphilosophical, is intended only to express that act of the mind, which renders realities, or what is taken for such, more present to us than fictions, causes them to weigh more in the thought, and gives them a superior influence on the passions and imagination. Provided we agree about the thing, it is needless to dispute about the terms. The imagination has the command over all its ideas, and can join and mix and vary them, in all the ways possible. It may conceive fictitious objects with all the circumstances of place and time. It may set them, in a manner, before our eyes, in their true colours, just as they might have existed. But as it is impossible, that this faculty of imagination can ever, of itself, reach belief, it is evident, that belief consists not in the peculiar nature or order of ideas, but in the *manner* of their conception, and in their *feeling* to the mind. I confess, that it is impossible perfectly to explain this feeling or manner of conception. We may make use of words, which express something near it. But its true and proper name, as we observed before, is *belief*; which is a term, that every one sufficiently understands in common life. And in philosophy, we can go no farther than assert, that *belief* is something felt by the mind, which distinguishes the ideas of the judgment from the fictions of the imagination. It gives them more weight and influence; makes them appear of *SBN 50* greater importance; enforces them in the mind; and renders them the governing principle of our actions. I hear at present, for instance, a person's voice, with whom I am acquainted; and the sound comes as from the next room. This impression of my senses immediately conveys my thought to the person, together with all the surrounding objects. I paint them out to myself as existing at present, with the same qualities and relations, of which I formerly knew them possessed. These ideas take faster hold of my mind, than ideas of an enchanted castle. They are very different to the feeling, and have a much greater influence of every kind, either to give pleasure or pain, joy or sorrow.

13 Let us, then, take in the whole compass of this doctrine, and allow, that the sentiment of belief is nothing but a conception more intense and steady than what attends the mere fictions of the imagination, and that this *manner* of conception arises from a customary conjunction of the object with something present to the memory or senses: I believe that it will not be difficult, upon these suppositions, to find other operations of the mind analogous to it, and to trace up these phænomena to principles still more general.

14 We have already observed, that nature has established connexions among particular ideas, and that no sooner one idea occurs to our thoughts than it

introduces its correlative, and carries our attention towards it, by a gentle and insensible movement. These principles of connexion or association we have reduced to three, namely, *Resemblance*, *Contiguity*, and *Causation*; which are the only bonds, that unite our thoughts together, and beget that regular train of reflection or discourse, which, in a greater or less degree, takes place among all mankind. Now here arises a question, on which the solution of the present difficulty will depend. Does it happen, in all these relations, that, when one of the objects is presented to the senses or memory, the mind is not *SBN 51* only carried to the conception of the correlative, but reaches a steadier and stronger conception of it than what otherwise it would have been able to attain? This seems to be the case with that belief, which arises from the relation of cause and effect. And if the case be the same with the other relations or principles of association, this may be established as a general law, which takes place in all the operations of the mind.

15 We may, therefore, observe, as the first experiment to our present purpose, that, upon the appearance of the picture of an absent friend, our idea of him is evidently enlivened by the *resemblance*, and that every passion, which that idea occasions, whether of joy or sorrow, acquires new force and vigour. In producing this effect, there concur both a relation and a present impression. Where the picture bears him no resemblance, or at least was not intended for him, it never so much as conveys our thought to him: And where it is absent, as well as the person; though the mind may pass from the thought of the one to that of the other; it feels its idea to be rather weakened than enlivened by that transition. We take a pleasure in viewing the picture of a friend, when it is set before us; but when it is removed, rather choose to consider him directly, than by reflection in an image, which is equally distant and obscure.

16 The ceremonies of the Roman Catholic religion may be considered as instances of the same nature. The devotees of that superstition usually plead in excuse for the mummeries, with which they are upbraided, that they feel the good effect of those external motions, and postures, and actions, in enlivening their devotion and quickening their fervour, which otherwise would decay, if directed entirely to distant and immaterial objects. We shadow out the objects of our faith, say they, in sensible types and images, and *SBN 52* render them more present to us by the immediate presence of these types, than it is possible for us to do, merely by an intellectual view and contemplation. Sensible objects have always a greater influence on the fancy than any other; and this influence they readily convey to those ideas, to which they are related, and which they resemble. I shall only infer from these practices, and this reasoning, that the effect of resemblance in enlivening the ideas is very

common; and as in every case a resemblance and a present impression must concur, we are abundantly supplied with experiments to prove the reality of the foregoing principle.

17 We may add force to these experiments by others of a different kind, in considering the effects of *contiguity* as well as of *resemblance*. It is certain, that distance diminishes the force of every idea, and that, upon our approach to any object; though it does not discover itself to our senses; it operates upon the mind with an influence, which imitates an immediate impression. The thinking on any object readily transports the mind to what is contiguous; but it is only the actual presence of an object, that transports it with a superior vivacity. When I am a few miles from home, whatever relates to it touches me more nearly than when I am two hundred leagues distant; though even at that distance the reflecting on any thing in the neighbourhood of my friends or family naturally produces an idea of them. But as in this latter case, both the objects of the mind are ideas; notwithstanding there is an easy transition between them; that transition alone is not able to give a superior vivacity to any of the ideas, for want of some immediate impression.[9]

18 No one can doubt but causation has the same influence as the other *SBN 53* two relations of resemblance and contiguity. Superstitious people are fond of the relicts of saints and holy men, for the same reason, that they seek after types or images, in order to enliven their devotion, and give them a more intimate and strong conception of those exemplary lives, which they desire to imitate. Now it is evident, that one of the best relicts, which a devotee could procure, would be the handywork of a saint; and if his cloaths and furniture are ever to be considered in this light, it is because they were once at his disposal, and were moved and affected by him; in which respect they are to be considered as imperfect effects, and as connected with him by a shorter chain of consequences than any of those, by which we learn the reality of his existence.

19 Suppose, that the son of a friend, who had been long dead or absent, were presented to us; it is evident, that this object would instantly revive its correlative idea, and recall to our thoughts all past intimacies and familiarities, in more lively colours than they would otherwise have appeared to us. This

[9] "Naturane nobis, inquit, datum dicam, an errore quodam, ut, cum ea loca videamus, in quibus *SBN 52* memoria dignos viros acceperimus multum esse versatos, magis moveamur, quam siquando eorum ipsorum aut facta audiamus aut scriptum aliquod legamus? Velut ego nunc moveor. Venit enim mihi *SBN 53* Platonis in mentem, quem accepimus primum hic disputare solitum: Cujus etiam illi hortuli propinqui non memoriam solum mihi afferunt, sed ipsum videntur in conspectu meo hic ponere. Hic Speusippus, hic Xenocrates, hic ejus auditor Polemo; cujus ipsa illa sessio fuit, quam videmus. Equidem etiam curiam nostram, Hostiliam dico, non hanc novam, quae mihi minor esse videtur postquam est major, solebam intuens, Scipionem, Catonem, Lælium, nostrum vero in primis avum cogitare. Tanta vis admonitionis inest in locis; ut non sine causa ex his memoriae ducta sit disciplina." Cicero, de finibus. lib. 5.

is another phænomenon, which seems to prove the principle above-mentioned.

20 We may observe, that, in these phænomena, the belief of the correlative object is always presupposed; without which the relation could have no effect. The influence of the picture supposes, that we *believe* our friend to have once existed. Contiguity to home can never excite our ideas of home, *SBN 54* unless we *believe* that it really exists. Now I assert, that this belief, where it reaches beyond the memory or senses, is of a similar nature, and arises from similar causes, with the transition of thought and vivacity of conception here explained. When I throw a piece of dry wood into a fire, my mind is immediately carried to conceive, that it augments, not extinguishes the flame. This transition of thought from the cause to the effect proceeds not from reason. It derives its origin altogether from custom and experience. And as it first begins from an object, present to the senses, it renders the idea or conception of flame more strong and lively than any loose, floating reverie of the imagination. That idea arises immediately. The thought moves instantly towards it, and conveys to it all that force of conception, which is derived from the impression present to the senses. When a sword is levelled at my breast, does not the idea of wound and pain strike me more strongly, than when a glass of wine is presented to me, even though by accident this idea should occur after the appearance of the latter object? But what is there in this whole matter to cause such a strong conception, except only a present object and a customary transition to the idea of another object, which we have been accustomed to conjoin with the former? This is the whole operation of the mind, in all our conclusions concerning matter of fact and existence; and it is a satisfaction to find some analogies, by which it may be explained. The transition from a present object does in all cases give strength and solidity to the related idea.

21 Here, then, is a kind of pre-established harmony between the course of nature and the succession of our ideas; and though the powers and forces, by which the former is governed, be wholly unknown to us; yet our thoughts and conceptions have still, we find, gone on in the same train with the other works *SBN 55* of nature. Custom is that principle, by which this correspondence has been effected; so necessary to the subsistence of our species, and the regulation of our conduct, in every circumstance and occurrence of human life. Had not the presence of an object instantly excited the idea of those objects, commonly conjoined with it, all our knowledge must have been limited to the narrow sphere of our memory and senses; and we should never have been able to adjust means to ends, or employ our natural powers, either to the producing of good, or avoiding of evil. Those, who delight in the discovery and

contemplation of *final causes*, have here ample subject to employ their wonder and admiration.

22 I shall add, for a further confirmation of the foregoing theory, that, as this operation of the mind, by which we infer like effects from like causes, and *vice versa*, is so essential to the subsistence of all human creatures, it is not probable, that it could be trusted to the fallacious deductions of our reason, which is slow in its operations; appears not, in any degree, during the first years of infancy; and at best is, in every age and period of human life, extremely liable to error and mistake. It is more conformable to the ordinary wisdom of nature to secure so necessary an act of the mind, by some instinct or mechanical tendency, which may be infallible in its operations, may discover itself at the first appearance of life and thought, and may be independent of all the laboured deductions of the understanding. As nature has taught us the use of our limbs, without giving us the knowledge of the muscles and nerves, by which they are actuated; so has she implanted in us an instinct, which carries forward the thought in a correspondent course to that which she has established among external objects; though we are ignorant of those powers and forces, on which this regular course and succession of objects totally depends.

SECTION 6

SBN 56

Of Probability[10]

1 THOUGH there be no such thing as *Chance* in the world; our ignorance of the real cause of any event has the same influence on the understanding, and begets a like species of belief or opinion.

2 There is certainly a probability, which arises from a superiority of chances on any side; and according as this superiority encreases, and surpasses the opposite chances, the probability receives a proportionable encrease, and begets still a higher degree of belief or assent to that side, in which we discover the superiority. If a dye were marked with one figure or number of spots on four sides, and with another figure or number of spots on the two remaining sides, it would be more probable, that the former would turn up than the latter; though if it had a thousand sides marked in the same manner, and only one side different, the probability would be much higher, and our belief or expectation of the event more steady and secure. This process of the thought or reasoning may seem trivial and obvious; but to those who consider it more narrowly, it may, perhaps, afford matter for curious speculation.

SBN 57

3 It seems evident, that, when the mind looks forward to discover the event, which may result from the throw of such a dye, it considers the turning up of each particular side as alike probable; and this is the very nature of chance, to render all the particular events, comprehended in it, entirely equal. But finding a greater number of sides concur in the one event than in the other, the mind is carried more frequently to that event, and meets it oftener, in revolving the various possibilities or chances, on which the ultimate result depends. This concurrence of several views in one particular event begets immediately, by an inexplicable contrivance of nature, the sentiment of belief, and gives that event the advantage over its antagonist, which is supported by a smaller number of views, and recurs less frequently to the mind. If we allow, that belief is nothing but a firmer and stronger conception of an object than what attends the mere fictions of the imagination, this operation may, perhaps, in some measure, be accounted for. The concurrence of these

[10] Mr. LOCKE divides all arguments into demonstrative and probable. In this view, we must say, that it is only probable all men must die, or that the sun will rise to-morrow. But to conform our language more to common use, we ought to divide arguments into *demonstrations*, *proofs*, and *probabilities*. By *proofs* meaning *such arguments from experience as leave no room for doubt or opposition*.

SBN 56

several views or glimpses imprints the idea more strongly on the imagination; gives it superior force and vigour; renders its influence on the passions and affections more sensible; and in a word, begets that reliance or security, which constitutes the nature of belief and opinion.

4 The case is the same with the probability of causes, as with that of chance. There are some causes, which are entirely uniform and constant in producing a particular effect; and no instance has ever yet been found of any failure or irregularity in their operation. Fire has always burned, and water suffocated every human creature: The production of motion by impulse and gravity is an universal law, which has hitherto admitted of no exception. But there are other causes, which have been found more irregular and uncertain; nor has rhubarb always proved a purge, or opium a soporific to every one, who *SBN 58* has taken these medicines. It is true, when any cause fails of producing its usual effect, philosophers ascribe not this to any irregularity in nature; but suppose, that some secret causes, in the particular structure of parts, have prevented the operation. Our reasonings, however, and conclusions concerning the event are the same as if this principle had no place. Being determined by custom to transfer the past to the future, in all our inferences; where the past has been entirely regular and uniform, we expect the event with the greatest assurance, and leave no room for any contrary supposition. But where different effects have been found to follow from causes, which are to *appearance* exactly similar, all these various effects must occur to the mind in transferring the past to the future, and enter into our consideration, when we determine the probability of the event. Though we give the preference to that which has been found most usual, and believe that this effect will exist, we must not overlook the other effects, but must assign to each of them a particular weight and authority, in proportion as we have found it to be more or less frequent. It is more probable, in almost every country of Europe, that there will be frost sometime in January, than that the weather will continue open throughout that whole month; though this probability varies according to the different climates, and approaches to a certainty in the more northern kingdoms. Here then it seems evident, that, when we transfer the past to the future, in order to determine the effect, which will result from any cause, we transfer all the different events, in the same proportion as they have appeared in the past, and conceive one to have existed a hundred times, for instance, another ten times, and another once. As a great number of views do here concur in one event, they fortify and confirm it to the imagination, beget that sentiment which we call *belief*, and give its object the preference above the contrary event, which is not supported by an equal number of experiments, *SBN 59* and recurs not so frequently to the thought in transferring the past to the

future. Let any one try to account for this operation of the mind upon any of the received systems of philosophy, and he will be sensible of the difficulty. For my part, I shall think it sufficient, if the present hints excite the curiosity of philosophers, and make them sensible how defective all common theories are, in treating of such curious and such sublime subjects.

SECTION 7

SBN 60

Of the Idea of Necessary Connexion

PART 1

1 THE great advantage of the mathematical sciences above the moral consists in this, that the ideas of the former, being sensible, are always clear and determinate, the smallest distinction between them is immediately perceptible, and the same terms are still expressive of the same ideas, without ambiguity or variation. An oval is never mistaken for a circle, nor an hyperbola for an ellipsis. The isosceles and scalenum are distinguished by boundaries more exact than vice and virtue, right and wrong. If any term be defined in geometry, the mind readily, of itself, substitutes, on all occasions, the definition for the term defined: Or even when no definition is employed, the object itself may be presented to the senses, and by that means be steadily and clearly apprehended. But the finer sentiments of the mind, the operations of the understanding, the various agitations of the passions, though really in themselves distinct, easily escape us, when surveyed by reflection; nor is it in our power to recall the original object, as often as we have occasion to contemplate it. Ambiguity, by this means, is gradually introduced into our reasonings: Similar objects are readily taken to be the same: And the conclusion becomes at last very wide of the premises.

2 One may safely, however, affirm, that, if we consider these sciences in a proper light, their advantages and disadvantages nearly compensate each other, and reduce both of them to a state of equality. If the mind, with greater facility, retains the ideas of geometry clear and determinate, it must carry on a much longer and more intricate chain of reasoning, and compare ideas much wider of each other, in order to reach the abstruser truths of that science. And if moral ideas are apt, without extreme care, to fall into obscurity and confusion, the inferences are always much shorter in these disquisitions, and the intermediate steps, which lead to the conclusion, much fewer than in the sciences which treat of quantity and number. In reality, there is scarcely a proposition in EUCLID so simple, as not to consist of more parts, than are to be found in any moral reasoning which runs not into chimera and conceit. Where we trace the principles of the human mind through a few steps, we may be very well satisfied with our progress; considering how soon

SBN 61

nature throws a bar to all our enquiries concerning causes, and reduces us to an acknowledgment of our ignorance. The chief obstacle, therefore, to our improvement in the moral or metaphysical sciences is the obscurity of the ideas, and ambiguity of the terms. The principal difficulty in the mathematics is the length of inferences and compass of thought, requisite to the forming of any conclusion. And, perhaps, our progress in natural philosophy is chiefly retarded by the want of proper experiments and phænomena, which are often discovered by chance, and cannot always be found, when requisite, even by the most diligent and prudent enquiry. As moral philosophy seems hitherto to have received less improvement than either geometry or physics, we may conclude, that, if there be any difference in this respect among these sciences, the difficulties, which obstruct the progress of the former, require superior care and capacity to be surmounted.

3 There are no ideas, which occur in metaphysics, more obscure and uncertain, than those of *power*, *force*, *energy*, or *necessary connexion*, of which it is every moment necessary for us to treat in all our disquisitions. We shall, therefore, endeavour, in this section, to fix, if possible, the precise meaning of these terms, and thereby remove some part of that obscurity, which is so much complained of in this species of philosophy. *SBN 62*

4 It seems a proposition, which will not admit of much dispute, that all our ideas are nothing but copies of our impressions, or, in other words, that it is impossible for us to *think* of any thing, which we have not antecedently *felt*, either by our external or internal senses. I have endeavoured[11] to explain and prove this proposition, and have expressed my hopes, that, by a proper application of it, men may reach a greater clearness and precision in philosophical reasonings, than what they have hitherto been able to attain. Complex ideas may, perhaps, be well known by definition, which is nothing but an enumeration of those parts or simple ideas, that compose them. But when we have pushed up definitions to the most simple ideas, and find still some ambiguity and obscurity; what resource are we then possessed of? By what invention can we throw light upon these ideas, and render them altogether precise and determinate to our intellectual view? Produce the impressions or original sentiments, from which the ideas are copied. These impressions are all strong and sensible. They admit not of ambiguity. They are not only placed in a full light themselves, but may throw light on their correspondent ideas, which lie in obscurity. And by this means, we may, perhaps, attain a new microscope or species of optics, by which, in the moral sciences, the most minute, and most simple ideas may be so enlarged as to fall readily under our apprehension, and

[11] Section 2. *SBN 62*

be equally known with the grossest and most sensible ideas, that can be the object of our enquiry.

5 To be fully acquainted, therefore, with the idea of power or necessary connexion, let us examine its impression; and in order to find the impression with greater certainty, let us search for it in all the sources, from which it may possibly be derived. *SBN 63*

6 When we look about us towards external objects, and consider the operation of causes, we are never able, in a single instance, to discover any power or necessary connexion; any quality, which binds the effect to the cause, and renders the one an infallible consequence of the other. We only find, that the one does actually, in fact, follow the other. The impulse of one billiard-ball is attended with motion in the second. This is the whole that appears to the *outward* senses. The mind feels no sentiment or *inward* impression from this succession of objects: Consequently, there is not, in any single, particular instance of cause and effect, any thing which can suggest the idea of power or necessary connexion.

7 From the first appearance of an object, we never can conjecture what effect will result from it. But were the power or energy of any cause discoverable by the mind, we could foresee the effect, even without experience; and might, at first, pronounce with certainty concerning it, by the mere dint of thought and reasoning.

8 In reality, there is no part of matter, that does ever, by its sensible qualities, discover any power or energy, or give us ground to imagine, that it could produce any thing, or be followed by any other object, which we could denominate its effect. Solidity, extension, motion; these qualities are all compleat in themselves, and never point out any other event which may result from them. The scenes of the universe are continually shifting, and one object follows another in an uninterrupted succession; but the power or force, which actuates the whole machine, is entirely concealed from us, and never discovers itself in any of the sensible qualities of body. We know, that, *SBN 64* in fact, heat is a constant attendant of flame; but what is the connexion between them, we have no room so much as to conjecture or imagine. It is impossible, therefore, that the idea of power can be derived from the contemplation of bodies, in single instances of their operation; because no bodies ever discover any power, which can be the original of this idea.[12]

[12] Mr. Locke, in his chapter of power, says, that, finding from experience, that there are several new productions in matter, and concluding that there must somewhere be a power capable of producing them, we arrive at last by this reasoning at the idea of power. But no reasoning can ever give us a new, original, simple idea; as this philosopher himself confesses. This, therefore, can never be the origin of that idea. *SBN 64*

9 Since, therefore, external objects, as they appear to the senses, give us no idea of power or necessary connexion, by their operation in particular instances, let us see, whether this idea be derived from reflection on the operations of our own minds, and be copied from any internal impression. It may be said, that we are every moment conscious of internal power; while we feel, that, by the simple command of our will, we can move the organs of our body, or direct the faculties of our mind. An act of volition produces motion in our limbs, or raises a new idea in our imagination. This influence of the will we know by consciousness. Hence we acquire the idea of power or energy; and are certain, that we ourselves and all other intelligent beings are 10 possessed of power. This idea, then, is an idea of reflection, since it arises from reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and on the command which is exercised by will, both over the organs of the body and faculties of the soul.

10 We shall proceed to examine this pretension; and first with regard to the influence of volition over the organs of the body. This influence, we may observe, is a fact, which, like all other natural events, can be known only by experience, and can never be foreseen from any apparent energy or power in *SBN 65* the cause, which connects it with the effect, and renders the one an infallible consequence of the other. The motion of our body follows upon the 20 command of our will. Of this we are every moment conscious. But the means, by which this is effected; the energy, by which the will performs so extraordinary an operation; of this we are so far from being immediately conscious, that it must for ever escape our most diligent enquiry.

11 For *first*, is there any principle in all nature more mysterious than the union of soul with body; by which a supposed spiritual substance acquires such an influence over a material one, that the most refined thought is able to actuate the grossest matter? Were we empowered, by a secret wish, to remove mountains, or controul the planets in their orbit; this extensive authority would not be more extraordinary, nor more beyond our comprehension. But if by con- 30 sciousness we perceived any power or energy in the will, we must know this power; we must know its connexion with the effect; we must know the secret union of soul and body, and the nature of both these substances; by which the one is able to operate, in so many instances, upon the other.

12 *Secondly*, We are not able to move all the organs of the body with a like authority; though we cannot assign any reason besides experience, for so remarkable a difference between one and the other. Why has the will an influence over the tongue and fingers, not over the heart or liver? This question would never embarrass us, were we conscious of a power in the former case,

not in the latter. We should then perceive, independent of experience, why the authority of will over the organs of the body is circumscribed within such particular limits. Being in that case fully acquainted with the power or force, by which it operates, we should also know, why its influence reaches precisely to such boundaries, and no farther.

13 A man, suddenly struck with a palsy in the leg or arm, or who had newly *SBN 66*
lost those members, frequently endeavours, at first, to move them, and employ them in their usual offices. Here he is as much conscious of power to command such limbs, as a man in perfect health is conscious of power to actuate any member which remains in its natural state and condition. But consciousness never deceives. Consequently, neither in the one case nor in the other, are we ever conscious of any power. We learn the influence of our will from experience alone. And experience only teaches us, how one event constantly follows another; without instructing us in the secret connexion, which binds them together, and renders them inseparable.

14 *Thirdly*, We learn from anatomy, that the immediate object of power in voluntary motion, is not the member itself which is moved, but certain muscles, and nerves, and animal spirits, and, perhaps, something still more minute and more unknown, through which the motion is successively propagated, ere it reach the member itself whose motion is the immediate object of volition. Can there be a more certain proof, that the power, by which this whole operation is performed, so far from being directly and fully known by an inward sentiment or consciousness, is, to the last degree, mysterious and unintelligible? Here the mind wills a certain event: Immediately another event, unknown to ourselves, and totally different from the one intended, is produced: This event produces another, equally unknown: Till at last, through a long succession, the desired event is produced. But if the original power were felt, it must be known: Were it known, its effect must also be known; since all power is relative to its effect. And *vice versa*, if the effect be not known, the power cannot be known nor felt. How indeed can we be conscious of a power to move our limbs, when we have no such power; but only that to move certain animal spirits, which, though they produce at last the motion of our limbs, yet operate in such a manner as is wholly beyond our *SBN 67*
comprehension?

15 We may, therefore, conclude from the whole, I hope, without any temerity, though with assurance; that our idea of power is not copied from any sentiment or consciousness of power within ourselves, when we give rise to animal motion, or apply our limbs to their proper use and office. That their motion follows the command of the will is a matter of common experience, like other

natural events: But the power or energy by which this is effected, like that in other natural events, is unknown and inconceivable.[13]

16 Shall we then assert, that we are conscious of a power or energy in our own minds, when, by an act or command of our will, we raise up a new idea, fix the mind to the contemplation of it, turn it on all sides, and at last dismiss it for some other idea, when we think that we have surveyed it with sufficient accuracy? I believe the same arguments will prove, that even this command of the will gives us no real idea of force or energy.

17 *First*, It must be allowed, that, when we know a power, we know that very circumstance in the cause, by which it is enabled to produce the effect: For *SBN 68* these are supposed to be synonimous. We must, therefore, know both the cause and effect, and the relation between them. But do we pretend to be acquainted with the nature of the human soul and the nature of an idea, or the aptitude of the one to produce the other? This is a real creation; a production of something out of nothing: Which implies a power so great, that it may seem, at first sight, beyond the reach of any being, less than infinite. At least it must be owned, that such a power is not felt, nor known, nor even conceivable by the mind. We only feel the event, namely, the existence of an idea, consequent to a command of the will: But the manner, in which this operation is performed; the power, by which it is produced; is entirely beyond our 20 comprehension.

18 *Secondly*, The command of the mind over itself is limited, as well as its command over the body; and these limits are not known by reason, or any acquaintance with the nature of cause and effect; but only by experience and observation, as in all other natural events and in the operation of external objects. Our authority over our sentiments and passions is much weaker than that over our ideas; and even the latter authority is circumscribed within very narrow boundaries. Will any one pretend to assign the ultimate reason of these boundaries, or show why the power is deficient in one case and not in another. 30

[13] It may be pretended, that the resistance which we meet with in bodies, obliging us frequently *SBN 67* to exert our force, and call up all our power, this gives us the idea of force and power. It is this *nisus* or strong endeavour, of which we are conscious, that is the original impression from which this idea is copied. But, *first*, we attribute power to a vast number of objects, where we never can suppose this resistance or exertion of force to take place; to the Supreme Being, who never meets with any resistance; to the mind in its command over its ideas and limbs, in common thinking and motion, where the effect follows immediately upon the will, without any exertion or summoning up of force; to inanimate matter, which is not capable of this sentiment. *Secondly*, This sentiment of an endeavour to overcome resistance has no known connexion with any event: What follows it, we know by experience; but could not know it *a priori*. It must, however, be confessed, that the animal *nisus*, 10 which we experience, though it can afford no accurate precise idea of power, enters very much into that vulgar, inaccurate idea, which is formed of it.

19 *Thirdly*, This self-command is very different at different times. A man in health possesses more of it, than one languishing with sickness. We are more master of our thoughts in the morning than in the evening: Fasting, than after a full meal. Can we give any reason for these variations, except experience? Where then is the power, of which we pretend to be conscious? Is there not here, either in a spiritual or material substance, or both, some secret mechanism or structure of parts, upon which the effect depends, and which, being entirely unknown to us, renders the power or energy of the will equally *SBN 69* unknown and incomprehensible?

20 Volition is surely an act of the mind, with which we are sufficiently 10 acquainted. Reflect upon it. Consider it on all sides. Do you find any thing in it like this creative power, by which it raises from nothing a new idea, and with a kind of FIAT, imitates the omnipotence of its Maker, if I may be allowed so to speak, who called forth into existence all the various scenes of nature? So far from being conscious of this energy in the will, it requires as certain experience, as that of which we are possessed, to convince us, that such extraordinary effects do ever result from a simple act of volition.

21 The generality of mankind never find any difficulty in accounting for the more common and familiar operations of nature; such as the descent of heavy bodies, the growth of plants, the generation of animals, or the nour- 20 ishment of bodies by food: But suppose, that, in all these cases, they perceive the very force or energy of the cause, by which it is connected with its effect, and is for ever infallible in its operation. They acquire, by long habit, such a turn of mind, that, upon the appearance of the cause, they immediately expect with assurance its usual attendant, and hardly conceive it possible, that any other event could result from it. It is only on the discovery of extraordinary phænomena, such as earthquakes, pestilence, and prodigies of any kind, that they find themselves at a loss to assign a proper cause, and to explain the manner, in which the effect is produced by it. It is usual for men, in such difficulties, to have recourse to some invisible intelligent principle,[14] 30 as the immediate cause of that event, which surprizes them, and which, they think, cannot be accounted for from the common powers of nature. But philosophers, who carry their scrutiny a little farther, immediately perceive, *SBN 70* that, even in the most familiar events, the energy of the cause is as unintelligible as in the most unusual, and that we only learn by experience the frequent CONJUNCTION of objects, without being ever able to comprehend any thing like CONNEXION between them. Here then, many philosophers think themselves obliged by reason to have recourse, on all occasions, to the same

[14] *Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς.* *SBN 69*

principle, which the vulgar never appeal to but in cases, that appear miraculous and supernatural. They acknowledge mind and intelligence to be, not only the ultimate and original cause of all things, but the immediate and sole cause of every event, which appears in nature. They pretend, that those objects, which are commonly denominated *causes*, are in reality nothing but *occasions*; and that the true and direct principle of every effect is not any power or force in nature, but a volition of the Supreme Being, who wills, that such particular objects should, for ever, be conjoined with each other. Instead of saying, that one billiard-ball moves another, by a force, which it has derived from the author of nature; it is the Deity himself, they say, who, by a particular volition, moves the second ball, being determined to this operation by the impulse of the first ball; in consequence of those general laws, which he has laid down to himself in the government of the universe. But philosophers, advancing still in their enquiries, discover, that, as we are totally ignorant of the power, on which depends the mutual operation of bodies, we are no less ignorant of that power, on which depends the operation of mind on body, or of body on mind; nor are we able, either from our senses or consciousness, to assign the ultimate principle in one case, more than in the other. The same ignorance, therefore, reduces them to the same conclusion. They assert, that the Deity is the immediate cause of the union between soul and body; and that they are not the organs of sense, which, being agitated by external objects, produce sensations in the mind; but that it is a particular *SBN 71* volition of our omnipotent Maker, which excites such a sensation, in consequence of such a motion in the organ. In like manner, it is not any energy in the will, that produces local motion in our members: It is God himself, who is pleased to second our will, in itself impotent, and to command that motion, which we erroneously attribute to our own power and efficacy. Nor do philosophers stop at this conclusion. They sometimes extend the same inference to the mind itself, in its internal operations. Our mental vision or conception of ideas is nothing but a revelation made to us by our Maker. When we voluntarily turn our thoughts to any object, and raise up its image in the fancy; it is not the will which creates that idea: It is the universal Creator, who discovers it to the mind, and renders it present to us.

22 Thus, according to these philosophers, every thing is full of God. Not content with the principle, that nothing exists but by his will, that nothing possesses any power but by his concession: They rob nature, and all created beings, of every power, in order to render their dependence on the Deity still more sensible and immediate. They consider not, that, by this theory, they diminish, instead of magnifying, the grandeur of those attributes, which they affect so much to celebrate. It argues surely more power in the Deity to delegate a certain degree of power to inferior creatures, than to produce

every thing by his own immediate volition. It argues more wisdom to contrive at first the fabric of the world with such perfect foresight, that, of itself, and by its proper operation, it may serve all the purposes of providence, than if the great Creator were obliged every moment to adjust its parts, and animate by his breath all the wheels of that stupendous machine.

23 But if we would have a more philosophical confutation of this theory, perhaps the two following reflections may suffice.

24 *First*, It seems to me, that this theory of the universal energy and operation *SBN 72*
of the Supreme Being, is too bold ever to carry conviction with it to a man, sufficiently apprized of the weakness of human reason, and the narrow 10
limits, to which it is confined in all its operations. Though the chain of arguments, which conduct to it, were ever so logical, there must arise a strong suspicion, if not an absolute assurance, that it has carried us quite beyond the reach of our faculties, when it leads to conclusions so extraordinary, and so remote from common life and experience. We are got into fairy land, long ere we have reached the last steps of our theory; and *there* we have no reason to trust our common methods of argument, or to think that our usual analogies and probabilities have any authority. Our line is too short to fathom such immense abysses. And however we may flatter ourselves, that we are guided, in every step which we take, by a kind of verisimilitude and experience; we 20
may be assured, that this fancied experience has no authority, when we thus apply it to subjects, that lie entirely out of the sphere of experience. But on this we shall have occasion to touch afterwards.[15]

25 *Secondly*, I cannot perceive any force in the arguments, on which this theory is founded. We are ignorant, it is true, of the manner in which bodies operate on each other: Their force or energy is entirely incomprehensible: But are we not equally ignorant of the manner or force by which a mind, even the supreme mind, operates either on itself or on body? Whence, I beseech you, do we acquire any idea of it? We have no sentiment or consciousness of this power in ourselves. We have no idea of the Supreme Being but what we 30
learn from reflection on our own faculties. Were our ignorance, therefore, a good reason for rejecting any thing, we should be led into that principle of *SBN 73*
denying all energy in the Supreme Being as much as in the grossest matter. We surely comprehend as little the operations of one as of the other. Is it more difficult to conceive, that motion may arise from impulse, than that it may arise from volition? All we know is our profound ignorance in both cases.[16]

[15] Section 12. *SBN 72*

[16] I need not examine at length the *vis inertiæ* which is so much talked of in the new philosophy, *SBN 73*
and which is ascribed to matter. We find by experience, that a body at rest or in motion continues for ever in its present state, till put from it by some new cause; and that a body impelled takes as much

PART 2

26 But to hasten to a conclusion of this argument, which is already drawn out to too great a length: We have sought in vain for an idea of power or necessary connexion, in all the sources from which we could suppose it to be derived. It appears, that, in single instances of the operation of bodies, we never can, by our utmost scrutiny, discover any thing but one event following another; without being able to comprehend any force or power, by which the cause operates, or any connexion between it and its supposed effect. The same dif- *SBN 74*
ficulty occurs in contemplating the operations of mind on body; where we observe the motion of the latter to follow upon the volition of the former; but are not able to observe or conceive the tye, which binds together the motion and volition, or the energy by which the mind produces this effect. The authority of the will over its own faculties and ideas is not a whit more comprehensible: So that, upon the whole, there appears not, throughout all nature, any one instance of connexion, which is conceivable by us. All events seem entirely loose and separate. One event follows another; but we never can observe any tye between them. They seem *conjoined*, but never *connected*. And as we can have no idea of any thing, which never appeared to our outward sense or inward sentiment, the necessary conclusion *seems* to be, that we have no idea of connexion or power at all, and that these words are absolutely without any meaning, when employed either in philosophical reasonings, or common life.

27 But there still remains one method of avoiding this conclusion, and one source which we have not yet examined. When any natural object or event is presented, it is impossible for us, by any sagacity or penetration, to discover, or even conjecture, without experience, what event will result from it, or to carry our foresight beyond that object, which is immediately present to the memory and senses. Even after one instance or experiment, where we have

motion from the impelling body as it acquires itself. These are facts. When we call this a *vis inertiæ*, we only mark these facts, without pretending to have any idea of the inert power; in the same manner as, when we talk of gravity, we mean certain effects, without comprehending that active power. It was never the meaning of Sir Isaac Newton to rob second causes of all force or energy; though some of his followers have endeavoured to establish that theory upon his authority. On the contrary, that great philosopher had recourse to an etherial active fluid to explain his universal attraction; though he was so cautious and modest as to allow, that it was a mere hypothesis, not to be insisted on, without more experiments. I must confess, that there is something in the fate of opinions a little extraordinary. Des Cartes insinuated that doctrine of the universal and sole efficacy of the Deity, without insisting on it. Malebranche and other Cartesians made it the foundation of all their philosophy. It had, however, no authority in England. Locke, Clarke, and Cudworth, never so much as take notice of it, but suppose all along, that matter has a real, though subordinate and derived power. By what means has it become so prevalent among our modern metaphysicians?

observed a particular event to follow upon another, we are not entitled to form a general rule, or foretel what will happen in like cases; it being justly esteemed an unpardonable temerity to judge of the whole course of nature from one single experiment, however accurate or certain. But when one particular species of event has always, in all instances, been conjoined with another, we make no longer any scruple of foretelling one upon the appear- *SBN 75*
ance of the other, and of employing that reasoning, which can alone assure us of any matter of fact or existence. We then call the one object, *Cause*; the other, *Effect*. We suppose, that there is some connexion between them; some power in the one, by which it infallibly produces the other, and operates with
the greatest certainty and strongest necessity.

28 It appears, then, that this idea of a necessary connexion among events arises from a number of similar instances, which occur, of the constant conjunction of these events; nor can that idea ever be suggested by any one of these instances, surveyed in all possible lights and positions. But there is nothing in a number of instances, different from every single instance, which is supposed to be exactly similar; except only, that after a repetition of similar instances, the mind is carried by habit, upon the appearance of one event, to expect its usual attendant, and to believe, that it will exist. This connexion, therefore, which we *feel* in the mind, this customary transition of the imagination from one object to its usual attendant, is the sentiment or impression, from which we form the idea of power or necessary connexion. Nothing farther is in the case. Contemplate the subject on all sides; you will never find any other origin of that idea. This is the sole difference between one instance, from which we can never receive the idea of connexion, and a number of similar instances, by which it is suggested. The first time a man saw the communication of motion by impulse, as by the shock of two billiard-balls, he could not pronounce that the one event was *connected*; but only that it was *conjoined* with the other. After he has observed several instances of this nature, he then pronounces them to be *connected*. What alteration has happened to give rise to this new idea of *connexion*? Nothing but that he now *feels* these events to be *connected* in his imagination, and can readily foretel the *SBN 76*
existence of one from the appearance of the other. When we say, therefore, that one object is connected with another, we mean only, that they have acquired a connexion in our thought, and give rise to this inference, by which they become proofs of each other's existence: A conclusion, which is somewhat extraordinary; but which seems founded on sufficient evidence. Nor will its evidence be weakened by any general diffidence of the understanding, or sceptical suspicion concerning every conclusion, which is new and extraordinary. No conclusions can be more agreeable to scepticism than such as

make discoveries concerning the weakness and narrow limits of human reason and capacity.

29 And what stronger instance can be produced of the surprizing ignorance and weakness of the understanding, than the present? For surely, if there be any relation among objects, which it imports to us to know perfectly, it is that of cause and effect. On this are founded all our reasonings concerning matter of fact or existence. By means of it alone we attain any assurance concerning objects, which are removed from the present testimony of our memory and senses. The only immediate utility of all sciences, is to teach us, how to controul and regulate future events by their causes. Our thoughts and enquiries are, therefore, every moment, employed about this relation. Yet so imperfect are the ideas which we form concerning it, that it is impossible to give any just definition of *cause*, except what is drawn from something extraneous and foreign to it. Similar objects are always conjoined with similar. Of this we have experience. Suitably to this experience, therefore, we may define a cause to be *an object, followed by another, and where all the objects, similar to the first, are followed by objects similar to the second*. Or in other words, *where, if the first object had not been, the second never had existed*. The appearance of a cause always conveys the mind, by a customary transition, to the idea of the effect. *SBN 77* Of this also we have experience. We may, therefore, suitably to this experience, form another definition of *cause*; and call it, *an object followed by another, and whose appearance always conveys the thought to that other*. But though both these definitions be drawn from circumstances foreign to the cause, we cannot remedy this inconvenience, or attain any more perfect definition, which may point out that circumstance in the cause, which gives it a connexion with its effect. We have no idea of this connexion; nor even any distinct notion what it is we desire to know, when we endeavour at a conception of it. We say, for instance, that the vibration of this string is the cause of this particular sound. But what do we mean by that affirmation? We either mean, *that this vibration is followed by this sound, and that all similar vibrations have been followed by similar sounds*: Or, *that this vibration is followed by this sound, and that upon the appearance of one, the mind anticipates the senses, and forms immediately an idea of the other*. We may consider the relation of cause and effect in either of these two lights; but beyond these, we have no idea of it.[17]

[17] According to these explications and definitions, the idea of *power* is relative as much as that of *cause*; and both have a reference to an effect, or some other event constantly conjoined with the former. When we consider the *unknown* circumstance of an object, by which the degree or quantity of its effect is fixed and determined, we call that its power: And accordingly, it is allowed by all philosophers, that the effect is the measure of the power. But if they had any idea of power, as it is in itself, why could not they measure it in itself? The dispute whether the force of a body in motion *SBN 77*

To recapitulate, therefore, the reasonings of this section: Every idea is SBN 78
copied from some preceding impression or sentiment; and where we cannot find any impression, we may be certain that there is no idea. In all single instances of the operation of bodies or minds, there is nothing that produces any impression, nor consequently can suggest any idea, of power or necessary connexion. But when many uniform instances appear, and the same object is always followed by the same event; we then begin to entertain the notion of cause and connexion. We then *feel* a new sentiment or impression, to wit, a customary connexion in the thought or imagination between one object and its usual attendant; and this sentiment is the original of that idea which we seek for. For as this idea arises from a number of similar instances, and not from any single instance; it must arise from that circumstance, in which the number of instances differ from every individual instance. But this customary connexion or transition of the imagination is the only circumstance, in which they differ. In every other particular they are alike. The first instance which we saw of motion, communicated by the shock of two billiard-balls (to return to this obvious illustration) is exactly similar to any instance that may, at present, occur to us; except only, that we could not, at first, *infer* one event from the other; which we are enabled to do at present, SBN 79
after so long a course of uniform experience. I know not, whether the reader will readily apprehend this reasoning. I am afraid, that, should I multiply words about it, or throw it into a greater variety of lights, it would only become more obscure and intricate. In all abstract reasonings, there is one point of view, which, if we can happily hit, we shall go farther towards illustrating the subject, than by all the eloquence and copious expression in the world. This point of view we should endeavour to reach, and reserve the flowers of rhetoric for subjects which are more adapted to them.

be as its velocity, or the square of its velocity; this dispute, I say, needed not be decided by comparing its effects in equal or unequal times; but by a direct mensuration and comparison.

As to the frequent use of the words, *force*, *power*, *energy*, &c. which every where occur in common conversation, as well as in philosophy; that is no proof, that we are acquainted, in any instance, with the connecting principle between cause and effect, or can account ultimately for the production of one thing by another. These words, as commonly used, have very loose meanings annexed to them; SBN 78
and their ideas are very uncertain and confused. No animal can put external bodies in motion without the sentiment of a *nisus* or endeavour; and every animal has a sentiment or feeling from the stroke or blow of an external object, that is in motion. These sensations, which are merely animal, and from which we can *a priori* draw no inference, we are apt to transfer to inanimate objects, and to suppose, that they have some such feelings, whenever they transfer or receive motion. With regard to energies, which are exerted, without our annexing to them any idea of communicated motion, we consider only the constant experienced conjunction of the events; and as we *feel* a customary connexion between the ideas, we transfer that feeling to the objects; as nothing is more usual than to apply to external bodies every internal sensation, which they occasion.

SECTION 8

SBN 80

Of Liberty and Necessity

PART 1

1 It might reasonably be expected, in questions, which have been canvassed and disputed with great eagerness, since the first origin of science and philosophy, that the meaning of all the terms, at least, should have been agreed upon among the disputants; and our enquiries, in the course of two thousand years, been able to pass from words to the true and real subject of the controversy. For how easy may it seem to give exact definitions of the terms employed in reasoning, and make these definitions, not the mere sound of words, the object of future scrutiny and examination? But if we consider the matter more narrowly, we shall be apt to draw a quite opposite conclusion. From this circumstance alone, that a controversy has been long kept on foot, and remains still undecided, we may presume, that there is some ambiguity in the expression, and that the disputants affix different ideas to the terms employed in the controversy. For as the faculties of the mind are supposed to be naturally alike in every individual; otherwise nothing could be more fruitless than to reason or dispute together; it were impossible, if men affix the same ideas to their terms, that they could so long form different opinions of the same subject; especially when they communicate their views, and each party turn themselves on all sides, in search of arguments, which may give them the victory over their antagonists. It is true; if men attempt the discussion of questions, which lie entirely beyond the reach of human capacity, such as those concerning the origin of worlds, or the œconomy of the intellectual system or region of spirits, they may long beat the air in their fruitless contests, and never arrive at any determinate conclusion. But if the question regard any subject of common life and experience; nothing, one would think, could preserve the dispute so long undecided, but some ambiguous expressions, which keep the antagonists still at a distance, and hinder them from grappling with each other.

SBN 81

2 This has been the case in the long disputed question concerning liberty and necessity; and to so remarkable a degree, that, if I be not much mistaken, we shall find, that all mankind, both learned and ignorant, have always been of the same opinion with regard to this subject, and that a few intelligible

definitions would immediately have put an end to the whole controversy. I own, that this dispute has been so much canvassed on all hands, and has led philosophers into such a labyrinth of obscure sophistry, that it is no wonder, if a sensible reader indulge his ease so far as to turn a deaf ear to the proposal of such a question, from which he can expect neither instruction nor entertainment. But the state of the argument here proposed may, perhaps, serve to renew his attention; as it has more novelty, promises at least some decision of the controversy, and will not much disturb his ease by any intricate or obscure reasoning.

3 I hope, therefore, to make it appear, that all men have ever agreed in the doctrines both of necessity and of liberty, according to any reasonable sense, which can be put on these terms; and that the whole controversy has hitherto turned merely upon words. We shall begin with examining the doctrine of necessity.

4 It is universally allowed, that matter, in all its operations, is actuated by a necessary force, and that every natural effect is so precisely determined by the energy of its cause, that no other effect, in such particular circumstances, could possibly have resulted from it. The degree and direction of every motion is, by the laws of nature, prescribed with such exactness, that a living creature may as soon arise from the shock of two bodies, as motion, in any other degree or direction than what is actually produced by it. Would we, therefore, form a just and precise idea of *necessity*, we must consider whence that idea arises, when we apply it to the operation of bodies. *SBN 82*

5 It seems evident, that, if all the scenes of nature were continually shifted in such a manner, that no two events bore any resemblance to each other, but every object was entirely new, without any similitude to whatever had been seen before, we should never, in that case, have attained the least idea of necessity, or of a connexion among these objects. We might say, upon such a supposition, that one object or event has followed another; not that one was produced by the other. The relation of cause and effect must be utterly unknown to mankind. Inference and reasoning concerning the operations of nature would, from that moment, be at an end; and the memory and senses remain the only canals, by which the knowledge of any real existence could possibly have access to the mind. Our idea, therefore, of necessity and causation arises entirely from the uniformity, observable in the operations of nature; where similar objects are constantly conjoined together, and the mind is determined by custom to infer the one from the appearance of the other. These two circumstances form the whole of that necessity, which we ascribe to matter. Beyond the constant *conjunction* of similar objects, and the

consequent *inference* from one to the other, we have no notion of any necessity, or connexion.

6 If it appear, therefore, that all mankind have ever allowed, without any *SBN 83* doubt or hesitation, that these two circumstances take place in the voluntary actions of men, and in the operations of the mind; it must follow, that all mankind have ever agreed in the doctrine of necessity, and that they have hitherto disputed, merely for not understanding each other.

7 As to the first circumstance, the constant and regular conjunction of similar events; we may possibly satisfy ourselves by the following considerations. It is universally acknowledged, that there is a great uniformity among the actions of men, in all nations and ages, and that human nature remains still the same, in its principles and operations. The same motives always produce the same actions: The same events follow from the same causes. Ambition, avarice, self-love, vanity, friendship, generosity, public spirit; these passions, mixed in various degrees, and distributed through society, have been, from the beginning of the world, and still are, the source of all the actions and enterprizes, which have ever been observed among mankind. Would you know the sentiments, inclinations, and course of life of the GREEKS and ROMANS? Study well the temper and actions of the FRENCH and ENGLISH: You cannot be much mistaken in transferring to the former *most* of the observations, which you have made with regard to the latter. Mankind are so much the same, in all times and places, that history informs us of nothing new or strange in this particular. Its chief use is only to discover the constant and universal principles of human nature, by showing men in all varieties of circumstances and situations, and furnishing us with materials, from which we may form our observations, and become acquainted with the regular springs of human action and behaviour. These records of wars, intrigues, factions, and revolutions, are so many collections of experiments, by which the politician or moral philosopher fixes the principles of his science; in the *SBN 84* same manner as the physician or natural philosopher becomes acquainted with the nature of plants, minerals, and other external objects, by the experiments, which he forms concerning them. Nor are the earth, water, and other elements, examined by ARISTOTLE, and HIPPOCRATES, more like to those, which at present lie under our observation, than the men, described by POLYBIUS and TACITUS, are to those who now govern the world.

8 Should a traveller, returning from a far country, bring us an account of men, wholly different from any, with whom we were ever acquainted; men, who were entirely divested of avarice, ambition, or revenge; who knew no pleasure but friendship, generosity, and public spirit; we should immediately, from these circumstances, detect the falsehood, and prove him a liar, with the

same certainty as if he had stuffed his narration with stories of centaurs and dragons, miracles and prodigies. And if we would explode any forgery in history, we cannot make use of a more convincing argument, than to prove, that the actions, ascribed to any person, are directly contrary to the course of nature, and that no human motives, in such circumstances, could ever induce him to such a conduct. The veracity of QUINTUS CURTIUS is as much to be suspected, when he describes the supernatural courage of ALEXANDER, by which he was hurried on singly to attack multitudes, as when he describes his supernatural force and activity, by which he was able to resist them. So readily and universally do we acknowledge a uniformity in human motives and actions as well as in the operations of body.

9 Hence likewise the benefit of that experience, acquired by long life and a variety of business and company, in order to instruct us in the principles of human nature, and regulate our future conduct, as well as speculation. By means of this guide, we mount up to the knowledge of men's inclinations *SBN 85* and motives, from their actions, expressions, and even gestures; and again, descend to the interpretation of their actions from our knowledge of their motives and inclinations. The general observations, treasured up by a course of experience, give us the clue of human nature, and teach us to unravel all its intricacies. Pretexts and appearances no longer deceive us. Public declarations pass for the specious colouring of a cause. And though virtue and honour be allowed their proper weight and authority, that perfect disinterestedness, so often pretended to, is never expected in multitudes and parties; seldom in their leaders; and scarcely even in individuals of any rank or station. But were there no uniformity in human actions, and were every experiment, which we could form of this kind, irregular and anomalous, it were impossible to collect any general observations concerning mankind; and no experience, however accurately digested by reflection, would ever serve to any purpose. Why is the aged husbandman more skilful in his calling than the young beginner, but because there is a certain uniformity in the operation of the sun, rain, and earth, towards the production of vegetables; and experience teaches the old practitioner the rules, by which this operation is governed and directed?

10 We must not, however, expect, that this uniformity of human actions should be carried to such a length, as that all men, in the same circumstances, will always act precisely in the same manner, without making any allowance for the diversity of characters, prejudices, and opinions. Such a uniformity in every particular, is found in no part of nature. On the contrary, from observing the variety of conduct in different men, we are enabled to form a greater variety of maxims, which still suppose a degree of uniformity and regularity.

11 Are the manners of men different in different ages and countries? We learn *SBN 86*
thence the great force of custom and education, which mould the human mind from its infancy, and form it into a fixed and established character. Is the behaviour and conduct of the one sex very unlike that of the other? It is thence we become acquainted with the different characters, which nature has impressed upon the sexes, and which she preserves with constancy and regularity. Are the actions of the same person much diversified in the different periods of his life, from infancy to old age? This affords room for many general observations concerning the gradual change of our sentiments and inclinations, and the different maxims, which prevail in the different ages of human creatures. Even the characters, which are peculiar to each individual, have a uniformity in their influence; otherwise our acquaintance with the persons, and our observation of their conduct, could never teach us their dispositions, or serve to direct our behaviour with regard to them.

12 I grant it possible to find some actions, which seem to have no regular connexion with any known motives, and are exceptions to all the measures of conduct, which have ever been established for the government of men. But if we would willingly know, what judgment should be formed of such irregular and extraordinary actions; we may consider the sentiments, commonly entertained with regard to those irregular events, which appear in the course of nature, and the operations of external objects. All causes are not conjoined to their usual effects, with like uniformity. An artificer, who handles only dead matter, may be disappointed of his aim, as well as the politician, who directs the conduct of sensible and intelligent agents.

13 The vulgar, who take things according to their first appearance, attribute the uncertainty of events to such an uncertainty in the causes as makes the latter often fail of their usual influence; though they meet with no impediment in their operation. But philosophers, observing, that, almost in every *SBN 87*
part of nature, there is contained a vast variety of springs and principles, which are hid, by reason of their minuteness or remoteness, find, that it is at least possible the contrariety of events may not proceed from any contingency in the cause, but from the secret operation of contrary causes. This possibility is converted into certainty by farther observation; when they remark, that, upon an exact scrutiny, a contrariety of effects always betrays a contrariety of causes, and proceeds from their mutual opposition. A peasant can give no better reason for the stopping of any clock or watch than to say that it does not commonly go right: But an artist easily perceives, that the same force in the spring or pendulum has always the same influence on the wheels; but fails of its usual effect, perhaps by reason of a grain of dust, which puts a stop to the whole movement. From the observation of several

parallel instances, philosophers form a maxim, that the connexion between all causes and effects is equally necessary, and that its seeming uncertainty in some instances proceeds from the secret opposition of contrary causes.

14 Thus for instance, in the human body, when the usual symptoms of health or sickness disappoint our expectation; when medicines operate not with their wonted powers; when irregular events follow from any particular cause; the philosopher and physician are not surprized at the matter, nor are ever tempted to deny, in general, the necessity and uniformity of those principles, by which the animal œconomy is conducted. They know, that a human body is a mighty complicated machine: That many secret powers lurk in it, which are altogether beyond our comprehension: That to us it must often appear very uncertain in its operations: And that therefore the irregular events, which outwardly discover themselves, can be no proof, that the laws of nature are not observed with the greatest regularity in its internal operations and government.

15 The philosopher, if he be consistent, must apply the same reasoning to the *SBN 88* actions and volitions of intelligent agents. The most irregular and unexpected resolutions of men may frequently be accounted for by those, who know every particular circumstance of their character and situation. A person of an obliging disposition gives a peevish answer: But he has the toothake, or has not dined. A stupid fellow discovers an uncommon alacrity in his carriage: But he has met with a sudden piece of good fortune. Or even when an action, as sometimes happens, cannot be particularly accounted for, either by the person himself or by others; we know, in general, that the characters of men are, to a certain degree, inconstant and irregular. This is, in a manner, the constant character of human nature; though it be applicable, in a more particular manner, to some persons, who have no fixed rule for their conduct, but proceed in a continued course of caprice and inconstancy. The internal principles and motives may operate in a uniform manner, notwithstanding these seeming irregularities; in the same manner as the winds, rain, clouds, and other variations of the weather are supposed to be governed by steady principles; though not easily discoverable by human sagacity and enquiry.

16 Thus it appears, not only that the conjunction between motives and voluntary actions is as regular and uniform, as that between the cause and effect in any part of nature; but also that this regular conjunction has been universally acknowledged among mankind, and has never been the subject of dispute, either in philosophy or common life. Now, as it is from past experience, that we draw all inferences concerning the future, and as we conclude, that objects will always be conjoined together, which we find to have always

been conjoined; it may seem superfluous to prove, that this experienced uniformity in human actions is a source, whence we draw *inferences* concerning them. But in order to throw the argument into a greater variety of lights, we *SBN 89* shall also insist, though briefly, on this latter topic.

17 The mutual dependence of men is so great, in all societies, that scarce any human action is entirely compleat in itself, or is performed without some reference to the actions of others, which are requisite to make it answer fully the intention of the agent. The poorest artificer, who labours alone, expects at least the protection of the magistrate, to ensure him the enjoyment of the fruits of his labour. He also expects, that, when he carries his goods to market, and offers them at a reasonable price, he shall find purchasers; and shall be able, by the money he acquires, to engage others to supply him with those commodities, which are requisite for his subsistence. In proportion as men extend their dealings, and render their intercourse with others more complicated, they always comprehend, in their schemes of life, a greater variety of voluntary actions, which they expect, from the proper motives, to co-operate with their own. In all these conclusions, they take their measures from past experience, in the same manner as in their reasonings concerning external objects; and firmly believe, that men, as well as all the elements, are to continue, in their operations, the same, that they have ever found them. A manufacturer reckons upon the labour of his servants, for the execution of any work, as much as upon the tools, which he employs, and would be equally surprized, were his expectations disappointed. In short, this experimental inference and reasoning concerning the actions of others enters so much into human life, that no man, while awake, is ever a moment without employing it. Have we not reason, therefore, to affirm, that all mankind have always agreed in the doctrine of necessity, according to the foregoing definition and explication of it?

18 Nor have philosophers ever entertained a different opinion from the people in this particular. For not to mention, that almost every action of their life supposes that opinion; there are even few of the speculative parts of *SBN 90* learning, to which it is not essential. What would become of *history*, had we not a dependence on the veracity of the historian, according to the experience, which we have had of mankind? How could *politics* be a science, if laws and forms of government had not a uniform influence upon society? Where would be the foundation of *morals*, if particular characters had no certain or determinate power to produce particular sentiments, and if these sentiments had no constant operation on actions? And with what pretence could we employ our *criticism* upon any poet or polite author, if we could not pronounce the conduct and sentiments of his actors, either natural or unnatural,

to such characters, and in such circumstances? It seems almost impossible, therefore, to engage, either in science or action of any kind, without acknowledging the doctrine of necessity, and this *inference* from motives to voluntary actions; from characters to conduct.

19 And indeed, when we consider how aptly *natural* and *moral* evidence link together, and form only one chain of argument, we shall make no scruple to allow, that they are of the same nature, and derived from the same principles. A prisoner, who has neither money nor interest, discovers the impossibility of his escape, as well when he considers the obstinacy of the gaoler, as the walls and bars, with which he is surrounded; and, in all attempts for his freedom, chooses rather to work upon the stone and iron of the one, than upon the inflexible nature of the other. The same prisoner, when conducted to the scaffold, foresees his death as certainly from the constancy and fidelity of his guards, as from the operation of the ax or wheel. His mind runs along a certain train of ideas: The refusal of the soldiers to consent to his escape; the action of the executioner; the separation of the head and body; bleeding, convulsive motions, and death. Here is a connected chain of natural causes and voluntary actions; but the mind feels no difference between them, in *SBN 91* passing from one link to another: Nor is less certain of the future event than if it were connected with the objects present to the memory or senses, by a train of causes, cemented together by what we are pleased to call a *physical* necessity. The same experienced union has the same effect on the mind, whether the united objects be motives, volition, and actions; or figure and motion. We may change the names of things; but their nature and their operation on the understanding never change.

20 Were a man, whom I know to be honest and opulent, and with whom I live in intimate friendship, to come into my house, where I am surrounded with my servants, I rest assured, that he is not to stab me before he leaves it, in order to rob me of my silver standish; and I no more suspect this event, than the falling of the house itself, which is new, and solidly built and founded.—*But he may have been seized with a sudden and unknown frenzy.*—So may a sudden earthquake arise, and shake and tumble my house about my ears. I shall therefore change the suppositions. I shall say, that I know with certainty, that he is not to put his hand into the fire, and hold it there, till it be consumed: And this event, I think I can foretel with the same assurance, as that, if he throw himself out at the window, and meet with no obstruction, he will not remain a moment suspended in the air. No suspicion of an unknown frenzy can give the least possibility to the former event, which is so contrary to all the known principles of human nature. A man who at noon leaves his purse full of gold on the pavement at Charing Cross, may as well expect that

it will fly away like a feather, as that he will find it untouched an hour after. Above one half of human reasonings contain inferences of a similar nature, attended with more or less degrees of certainty, proportioned to our experience of the usual conduct of mankind in such particular situations.

21 I have frequently considered, what could possibly be the reason, why all *SBN 92*
mankind, though they have ever, without hesitation, acknowledged the doctrine of necessity, in their whole practice and reasoning, have yet discovered such a reluctance to acknowledge it in words, and have rather shown a propensity, in all ages, to profess the contrary opinion. The matter, I think, may be accounted for, after the following manner. If we examine the operations of body, and the production of effects from their causes, we shall find, that all our faculties can never carry us farther in our knowledge of this relation, than barely to observe, that particular objects are *constantly conjoined* together, and that the mind is carried, by a *customary transition*, from the appearance of one to the belief of the other. But though this conclusion concerning human ignorance be the result of the strictest scrutiny of this subject, men still entertain a strong propensity to believe, that they penetrate farther into the powers of nature, and perceive something like a necessary connexion between the cause and the effect. When again they turn their reflections towards the operations of their own minds, and *feel* no such connexion of the motive and the action; they are thence apt to suppose, that there is a difference between the effects, which result from material force, and those which arise from thought and intelligence. But being once convinced, that we know nothing farther of causation of any kind, than merely the *constant conjunction* of objects, and the consequent *inference* of the mind from one to another, and finding, that these two circumstances are universally allowed to have place in voluntary actions; we may be more easily led to own the same necessity common to all causes. And though this reasoning may contradict the systems of many philosophers, in ascribing necessity to the determinations of the will, we shall find, upon reflection, that they dissent from it in words only, not in their real sentiment. Necessity, according to the sense, in which it is here taken, has never yet been rejected, nor can ever, I *SBN 93*
think, be rejected by any philosopher. It may only, perhaps, be pretended, that the mind can perceive, in the operations of matter, some farther connexion between the cause and effect; and a connexion that has not place in the voluntary actions of intelligent beings. Now whether it be so or not, can only appear upon examination; and it is incumbent on these philosophers to make good their assertion, by defining or describing that necessity, and pointing it out to us in the operations of material causes.

22 It would seem, indeed, that men begin at the wrong end of this question

concerning liberty and necessity, when they enter upon it by examining the faculties of the soul, the influence of the understanding, and the operations of the will. Let them first discuss a more simple question, namely, the operations of body and of brute unintelligent matter; and try whether they can there form any idea of causation and necessity, except that of a constant conjunction of objects, and subsequent inference of the mind from one to another. If these circumstances form, in reality, the whole of that necessity, which we conceive in matter, and if these circumstances be also universally acknowledged to take place in the operations of the mind, the dispute is at an end; at least, must be owned to be thenceforth merely verbal. But as long as we will rashly suppose, that we have some farther idea of necessity and causation in the operations of external objects; at the same time, that we can find nothing farther, in the voluntary actions of the mind; there is no possibility of bringing the question to any determinate issue, while we proceed upon so erroneous a supposition. The only method of undeceiving us, is, to mount up higher; to examine the narrow extent of science when applied to material causes; and to convince ourselves, that all we know of them, is, the constant conjunction and inference above-mentioned. We may, perhaps, find, that it is with difficulty we are induced to fix such narrow limits to *SBN 94* human understanding: But we can afterwards find no difficulty, when we come to apply this doctrine to the actions of the will. For as it is evident, that these have a regular conjunction with motives and circumstances and characters, and as we always draw inferences from one to the other, we must be obliged to acknowledge in words, that necessity, which we have already avowed, in every deliberation of our lives, and in every step of our conduct and behaviour.[18]

[18] The prevalence of the doctrine of liberty may be accounted for, from another cause, *viz*. a false *SBN 94* sensation or seeming experience which we have, or may have, of liberty or indifference, in many of our actions. The necessity of any action, whether of matter or of mind, is not, properly speaking, a quality in the agent, but in any thinking or intelligent being, who may consider the action; and it consists chiefly in the determination of his thoughts to infer the existence of that action from some preceding objects; as liberty, when opposed to necessity, is nothing but the want of that determination, and a certain looseness or indifference, which we feel, in passing, or not passing, from the idea of one object to that of any succeeding one. Now we may observe, that, though, in *reflecting* on human actions, we seldom feel such a looseness or indifference, but are commonly able to infer them with considerable certainty from their motives, and from the dispositions of the agent; yet it frequently happens, that, in *performing* the actions themselves, we are sensible of something like it: And as all resembling objects are readily taken for each other, this has been employed as a demonstrative and even intuitive proof of human liberty. We feel, that our actions are subject to our will, on most occasions; and imagine we feel, that the will itself is subject to nothing, because, when by a denial of it we are provoked to try, we feel, that it moves easily every way, and produces an image of itself, (or a *Velleity*, as it is called in the schools) even on that side, on which it did not settle. This image, or faint motion, we persuade ourselves, could, at that time, have been compleated into the

23 But to proceed in this reconciling project with regard to the question of *SBN 95*
liberty and necessity; the most contentious question, of metaphysics, the most contentious science; it will not require many words to prove, that all mankind have ever agreed in the doctrine of liberty as well as in that of necessity, and that the whole dispute, in this respect also, has been hitherto merely verbal. For what is meant by *liberty*, when applied to voluntary actions? We cannot surely mean, that actions have so little connexion with motives, inclinations, and circumstances, that one does not follow with a certain degree of uniformity from the other, and that one affords no inference by which we can conclude the existence of the other. For these are plain and acknowledged matters of fact. By *liberty*, then, we can only mean *a power of acting or not acting, according to the determinations of the will*; that is, if we choose to remain at rest, we may; if we choose to move, we also may. Now this hypothetical liberty is universally allowed to belong to every one, who is not a prisoner and in chains. Here then is no subject of dispute.

24 Whatever definition we may give of *liberty*, we should be careful to observe two requisite circumstances; *first*, that it be consistent with plain matter of fact; *secondly*, that it be consistent with itself. If we observe these circumstances, and render our definition intelligible, I am persuaded that all mankind will be found of one opinion with regard to it.

25 It is universally allowed, that nothing exists without a cause of its existence, and that *chance*, when strictly examined, is a mere negative word, and means not any real power, which has, any where, a being in nature. But it is pretended, that some causes are necessary, some not necessary. Here then is the advantage of definitions. Let any one *define* a cause, without comprehending, as a part of the definition, a *necessary connexion* with its effect; and let him show distinctly the origin of the idea, expressed by the definition; and *SBN 96*
I shall readily give up the whole controversy. But if the foregoing explication of the matter be received, this must be absolutely impracticable. Had not objects a regular conjunction with each other, we should never have entertained any notion of cause and effect; and this regular conjunction produces that inference of the understanding, which is the only connexion, that we can have any comprehension of. Whoever attempts a definition of *cause*, exclusive of these circumstances, will be obliged, either to employ unintelligible

thing itself; because, should that be denied, we find, upon a second trial, that, at present, it can. We consider not, that the fantastical desire of showing liberty, is here the motive of our actions. And it seems certain, that, however we may imagine we feel a liberty within ourselves, a spectator can commonly infer our actions from our motives and character; and even where he cannot, he concludes in general, that he might, were he perfectly acquainted with every circumstance of our situation and temper, and the most secret springs of our complexion and disposition. Now this is the very essence of necessity, according to the foregoing doctrine.

terms, or such as are synonimous to the term, which he endeavours to define.[19] And if the definition above-mentioned be admitted; liberty, when opposed to necessity, not to constraint, is the same thing with chance; which is universally allowed to have no existence.

PART 2

26 There is no method of reasoning more common, and yet none more blameable, than, in philosophical disputes, to endeavour the refutation of any hypothesis, by a pretence of its dangerous consequences to religion and morality. When any opinion leads to absurdities, it is certainly false; but it is not certain that an opinion is false, because it is of dangerous consequence. Such topics, therefore, ought entirely to be forborne; as serving nothing to the discovery of truth, but only to make the person of an antagonist odious. This I observe in general, without pretending to draw any advantage *SBN 97* from it. I frankly submit to an examination of this kind, and shall venture to affirm, that the doctrines, both of necessity and of liberty, as above explained, are not only consistent with morality, but are absolutely essential to its support.

27 *Necessity* may be defined two ways, conformably to the two definitions of *cause*, of which it makes an essential part. It consists either in *the constant conjunction of like objects*, or in *the inference of the understanding from one object to another*. Now necessity, in both these senses, (which, indeed, are, at bottom, the same) has universally, though tacitly, in the schools, in the pulpit, and in common life, been allowed to belong to the will of man; and no one has ever pretended to deny, that we can draw inferences concerning human actions, and that those inferences are founded on the experienced union of like actions, with like motives, inclinations, and circumstances. The only particular, in which any one can differ, is, that either, perhaps, he will refuse to give the name of *necessity* to this property of human actions: But as long as the meaning is understood, I hope the word can do no harm: Or that he will maintain it possible to discover something farther in the operations of matter. But this, it must be acknowledged, can be of no consequence to morality or religion, whatever it may be to natural philosophy or metaphysics. We may

[19] Thus, if a cause be defined, *that which produces any thing*; it is easy to observe, that *producing* is *SBN 96* synonimous to *causing*. In like manner, if a cause be defined, *that by which any thing exists*; this is liable to the same objection. For what is meant by these words, *by which*? Had it been said, that a cause is *that* after which *any thing constantly exists*; we should have understood the terms. For this is, indeed, all we know of the matter. And this constancy forms the very essence of necessity, nor have we any other idea of it.

here be mistaken in asserting, that there is no idea of any other necessity or connexion in the actions of body: But surely we ascribe nothing to the actions of the mind, but what every one does, and must readily allow of. We change no circumstance in the received orthodox system with regard to the will, but only in that with regard to material objects and causes. Nothing therefore can be more innocent, at least, than this doctrine.

28 All laws being founded on rewards and punishments, it is supposed as a fundamental principle, that these motives have a regular and uniform influence on the mind, and both produce the good and prevent the evil actions. We may give to this influence what name we please; but as it is usually conjoined with the action, it must be esteemed a *cause*, and be looked upon as an instance of that necessity, which we would here establish. *SBN 98*

29 The only proper object of hatred or vengeance, is a person or creature, endowed with thought and consciousness; and when any criminal or injurious actions excite that passion, it is only by their relation to the person, or connexion with him. Actions are, by their very nature, temporary and perishing; and where they proceed not from some *cause* in the character and disposition of the person who performed them, they can neither redound to his honour, if good; nor infamy, if evil. The actions themselves may be blameable; they may be contrary to all the rules of morality and religion: But the person is not answerable for them; and as they proceeded from nothing in him, that is durable and constant, and leave nothing of that nature behind them, it is impossible he can, upon their account, become the object of punishment or vengeance. According to the principle, therefore, which denies necessity, and consequently causes, a man is as pure and untainted, after having committed the most horrid crime, as at the first moment of his birth, nor is his character any wise concerned in his actions; since they are not derived from it, and the wickedness of the one can never be used as a proof of the depravity of the other.

30 Men are not blamed for such actions, as they perform ignorantly and casually, whatever may be the consequences. Why? but because the principles of these actions are only momentary, and terminate in them alone. Men are less blamed for such actions as they perform hastily and unpremeditately, than for such as proceed from deliberation. For what reason? but because a hasty temper, though a constant cause or principle in the mind, operates only by intervals, and infects not the whole character. Again, repentance wipes off every crime, if attended with a reformation of life and manners. How is this to be accounted for? but by asserting, that actions render a person criminal, merely as they are proofs of criminal principles in the mind; and when, by an *SBN 99*

alteration of these principles, they cease to be just proofs, they likewise cease to be criminal. But, except upon the doctrine of necessity, they never were just proofs, and consequently never were criminal.

31 It will be equally easy to prove, and from the same arguments, that *liberty*, according to that definition above-mentioned, in which all men agree, is also essential to morality, and that no human actions, where it is wanting, are susceptible of any moral qualities, or can be the objects either of approbation or dislike. For as actions are objects of our moral sentiment, so far only as they are indications of the internal character, passions, and affections; it is impossible that they can give rise either to praise or blame, where they proceed not from these principles, but are derived altogether from external violence.

32 I pretend not to have obviated or removed all objections to this theory, with regard to necessity and liberty. I can foresee other objections, derived from topics, which have not here been treated of. It may be said, for instance, that, if voluntary actions be subjected to the same laws of necessity with the operations of matter, there is a continued chain of necessary causes, pre-ordained and pre-determined, reaching from the original cause of all, to every single volition of every human creature. No contingency any where in the universe; no indifference; no liberty. While we act, we are, at the same time, acted upon. The ultimate Author of all our volitions is the Creator of the world, who first bestowed motion on this immense machine, and placed all beings in that particular position, whence every subsequent event, by an inevitable necessity, must result. Human actions, therefore, either can have no moral turpitude at all, as proceeding from so good a cause; or if they have any turpitude, they must involve our Creator in the same guilt, while he is acknowledged to be their ultimate cause and author. For as a man, who fired a mine, is answerable for all the consequences, whether the train he employed be long or short; so wherever a continued chain of necessary causes is fixed, that Being, either finite or infinite, who produces the first, is likewise the author of all the rest, and must both bear the blame and acquire the praise, which belong to them. Our clear and unalterable ideas of morality establish this rule, upon unquestionable reasons, when we examine the consequences of any human action; and these reasons must still have greater force, when applied to the volitions and intentions of a Being, infinitely wise and powerful. Ignorance or impotence may be pleaded for so limited a creature as man; but those imperfections have no place in our Creator. He foresaw, he ordained, he intended all those actions of men, which we so rashly pronounce criminal. And we must therefore conclude, either that they are not criminal, or that the Deity, not

SBN 100

man, is accountable for them. But as either of these positions is absurd and impious, it follows, that the doctrine, from which they are deduced, cannot possibly be true, as being liable to all the same objections. An absurd consequence, if necessary, proves the original doctrine to be absurd; in the same manner as criminal actions render criminal the original cause, if the connexion between them be necessary and inevitable.

33 This objection consists of two parts, which we shall examine separately; *first*, that, if human actions can be traced up, by a necessary chain, to the Deity, they can never be criminal; on account of the infinite perfection of that Being, from whom they are derived, and who can intend nothing but what is *SBN 101* altogether good and laudable. Or, *secondly*, if they be criminal, we must retract the attribute of perfection, which we ascribe to the Deity, and must acknowledge him to be the ultimate author of guilt and moral turpitude in all his creatures.

34 The answer to the first objection seems obvious and convincing. There are many philosophers, who, after an exact scrutiny of all the phænomena of nature, conclude, that the WHOLE, considered as one system, is, in every period of its existence, ordered with perfect benevolence; and that the utmost possible happiness will, in the end, result to all created beings, without any mixture of positive or absolute ill and misery. Every physical ill, say they, 20 makes an essential part of this benevolent system, and could not possibly be removed, even by the Deity himself, considered as a wise agent, without giving entrance to greater ill, or excluding greater good, which will result from it. From this theory, some philosophers, and the ancient STOICS among the rest, derived a topic of consolation under all afflictions, while they taught their pupils, that those ills, under which they laboured, were, in reality, goods to the universe; and that to an enlarged view, which could comprehend the whole system of nature, every event became an object of joy and exultation. But though this topic be specious and sublime, it was soon found in practice weak and ineffectual. You would surely more irritate, than appease a man, 30 lying under the racking pains of the gout, by preaching up to him the rectitude of those general laws, which produced the malignant humours in his body, and led them through the proper canals, to the sinews and nerves, where they now excite such acute torments. These enlarged views may, for a moment, please the imagination of a speculative man, who is placed in ease and security; but neither can they dwell with constancy on his mind, even though undisturbed by the emotions of pain or passion; much less can they *SBN 102* maintain their ground, when attacked by such powerful antagonists. The affections take a narrower and more natural survey of their object; and by an œconomy, more suitable to the infirmity of human minds, regard alone the 40

beings around us, and are actuated by such events as appear good or ill to the private system.

35 The case is the same with *moral* as with *physical* ill. It cannot reasonably be supposed, that those remote considerations, which are found of so little efficacy with regard to one, will have a more powerful influence with regard to the other. The mind of man is so formed by nature, that, upon the appearance of certain characters, dispositions, and actions, it immediately feels the sentiment of approbation or blame; nor are there any emotions more essential to its frame and constitution. The characters, which engage our approbation, are chiefly such as contribute to the peace and security of human society; as 10 the characters, which excite blame, are chiefly such as tend to public detriment and disturbance: Whence it may reasonably be presumed, that the moral sentiments arise, either mediately or immediately, from a reflection on these opposite interests. What though philosophical meditations establish a different opinion or conjecture; that every thing is right with regard to the WHOLE, and that the qualities, which disturb society, are, in the main, as beneficial, and are as suitable to the primary intention of nature, as those which more directly promote its happiness and welfare? Are such remote and uncertain speculations able to counterbalance the sentiments, which arise from the natural and immediate view of the objects? A man, who is robbed of 20 a considerable sum; does he find his vexation for the loss any wise diminished by these sublime reflections? Why then should his moral resentment against the crime be supposed incompatible with them? Or why should not the acknowledgment of a real distinction between vice and virtue be reconcileable to all speculative systems of philosophy, as well as that of a real dis- *SBN 103* tinction between personal beauty and deformity? Both these distinctions are founded in the natural sentiments of the human mind: And these sentiments are not to be controuled or altered by any philosophical theory or speculation whatsoever.

36 The *second* objection admits not of so easy and satisfactory an answer; nor 30 is it possible to explain distinctly, how the Deity can be the mediate cause of all the actions of men, without being the author of sin and moral turpitude. These are mysteries, which mere natural and unassisted reason is very unfit to handle; and whatever system she embraces, she must find herself involved in inextricable difficulties, and even contradictions, at every step which she takes with regard to such subjects. To reconcile the indifference and contingency of human actions with prescience; or to defend absolute decrees, and yet free the Deity from being the author of sin, has been found hitherto to exceed all the power of philosophy. Happy, if she be thence sensible of her temerity, when she pries into these sublime mysteries; and leaving a scene so 40

full of obscurities and perplexities, return, with suitable modesty, to her true and proper province, the examination of common life; where she will find difficulties enow to employ her enquiries, without launching into so boundless an ocean of doubt, uncertainty, and contradiction!

SECTION 9

SBN 104

Of the Reason of Animals

1 ALL our reasonings concerning matter of fact are founded on a species of ANALOGY, which leads us to expect from any cause the same events, which we have observed to result from similar causes. Where the causes are entirely similar, the analogy is perfect, and the inference, drawn from it, is regarded as certain and conclusive: Nor does any man ever entertain a doubt, where he sees a piece of iron, that it will have weight and cohesion of parts; as in all other instances, which have ever fallen under his observation. But where the objects have not so exact a similarity, the analogy is less perfect, and the inference is less conclusive; though still it has some force, in proportion to the degree of similarity and resemblance. The anatomical observations, formed upon one animal, are, by this species of reasoning, extended to all animals; and it is certain, that when the circulation of the blood, for instance, is clearly proved to have place in one creature, as a frog, or fish, it forms a strong presumption, that the same principle has place in all. These analogical observations may be carried farther, even to this science, of which we are now treating; and any theory, by which we explain the operations of the understanding, or the origin and connexion of the passions in man, will acquire additional authority, if we find, that the same theory is requisite to explain the same phænomena in all other animals. We shall make trial of this, with regard to the hypothesis, by which, we have, in the foregoing discourse, endeavoured to account for all experimental reasonings; and it is hoped, that this new point of view will serve to confirm all our former observations.

SBN 105

2 *First*, It seems evident, that animals, as well as men, learn many things from experience, and infer, that the same events will always follow from the same causes. By this principle they become acquainted with the more obvious properties of external objects, and gradually, from their birth, treasure up a knowledge of the nature of fire, water, earth, stones, heights, depths, *&c.* and of the effects, which result from their operation. The ignorance and inexperience of the young are here plainly distinguishable from the cunning and sagacity of the old, who have learned, by long observation, to avoid what hurt them, and to pursue what gave ease or pleasure. A horse, that has been accustomed to the field, becomes acquainted with the proper height, which he can leap, and will never attempt what exceeds his force and ability. An old

greyhound will trust the more fatiguing part of the chace to the younger, and will place himself so as to meet the hare in her doubles; nor are the conjectures, which he forms on this occasion, founded in any thing but his observation and experience.

3 This is still more evident from the effects of discipline and education on animals, who, by the proper application of rewards and punishments, may be taught any course of action, the most contrary to their natural instincts and propensities. Is it not experience, which renders a dog apprehensive of pain, when you menace him, or lift up the whip to beat him? Is it not even experience, which makes him answer to his name, and infer, from such an arbitrary sound, that you mean him rather than any of his fellows, and intend to call him, when you pronounce it in a certain manner, and with a certain tone and accent?

4 In all these cases, we may observe, that the animal infers some fact beyond what immediately strikes his senses; and that this inference is altogether founded on past experience, while the creature expects from the present object the same consequences, which it has always found in its observation to result from similar objects. *SBN 106*

5 *Secondly*, It is impossible, that this inference of the animal can be founded on any process of argument or reasoning, by which he concludes, that like events must follow like objects, and that the course of nature will always be regular in its operations. For if there be in reality any arguments of this nature, they surely lie too abstruse for the observation of such imperfect understandings; since it may well employ the utmost care and attention of a philosophic genius to discover and observe them. Animals, therefore, are not guided in these inferences by reasoning: Neither are children: Neither are the generality of mankind, in their ordinary actions and conclusions: Neither are philosophers themselves, who, in all the active parts of life, are, in the main, the same with the vulgar, and are governed by the same maxims. Nature must have provided some other principle, of more ready, and more general use and application; nor can an operation of such immense consequence in life, as that of inferring effects from causes, be trusted to the uncertain process of reasoning and argumentation. Were this doubtful with regard to men, it seems to admit of no question with regard to the brute creation; and the conclusion being once firmly established in the one, we have a strong presumption, from all the rules of analogy, that it ought to be universally admitted, without any exception or reserve. It is custom alone, which engages animals, from every object, that strikes their senses, to infer its usual attendant, and carries their imagination, from the appearance of the one, to conceive the other, in that particular manner, which we denominate *belief*. No other expli-

cation can be given of this operation, in all the higher, as well as lower classes of sensitive beings, which fall under our notice and observation.[20] *SBN 107*

6 But though animals learn many parts of their knowledge from observation, there are also many parts of it, which they derive from the original hand of nature; which much exceed the share of capacity they possess on ordinary occasions; and in which they improve, little or nothing, by the longest practice and experience. These we denominate *instincts*, and are so apt to admire, as something very extraordinary, and inexplicable by all the disquisitions of human understanding. But our wonder will, perhaps, cease or diminish; when we consider, that the experimental reasoning itself, which we possess in common with beasts, and on which the whole conduct of life depends, is nothing but a species of instinct or mechanical power, that acts in us unknown to ourselves; and in its chief operations, is not directed by any such relations or comparisons of ideas, as are the proper objects of our intellectual *SBN 108*

[20] Since all reasoning concerning facts or causes is derived merely from custom, it may be asked how it happens, that men so much surpass animals in reasoning, and one man so much surpasses another? Has not the same custom the same influence on all? *SBN 107*

We shall here endeavour briefly to explain the great difference in human understandings: After which the reason of the difference between men and animals will easily be comprehended.

1. When we have lived any time, and have been accustomed to the uniformity of nature, we acquire a general habit, by which we always transfer the known to the unknown, and conceive the latter to resemble the former. By means of this general habitual principle, we regard even one experiment as the foundation of reasoning, and expect a similar event with some degree of certainty, where the experiment has been made accurately, and free from all foreign circumstances. It is therefore considered as a matter of great importance to observe the consequences of things; and as one man may very much surpass another in attention and memory and observation, this will make a very great difference in their reasoning.

2. Where there is a complication of causes to produce any effect, one mind may be much larger than another, and better able to comprehend the whole system of objects, and to infer justly their consequences.

3. One man is able to carry on a chain of consequences to a greater length than another.

4. Few men can think long without running into a confusion of ideas, and mistaking one for another; and there are various degrees of this infirmity.

5. The circumstance, on which the effect depends, is frequently involved in other circumstances, which are foreign and extrinsic. The separation of it often requires great attention, accuracy, and subtilty.

6. The forming of general maxims from particular observation is a very nice operation; and nothing is more usual, from haste or a narrowness of mind, which sees not on all sides, than to commit mistakes in this particular.

7. When we reason from analogies, the man, who has the greater experience or the greater promptitude of suggesting analogies, will be the better reasoner.

8. Biasses from prejudice, education, passion, party, *&c.* hang more upon one mind than another.

9. After we have acquired a confidence in human testimony, books and conversation enlarge much more the sphere of one man's experience and thought than those of another.

It would be easy to discover many other circumstances that make a difference in the understandings of men.

faculties. Though the instinct be different, yet still it is an instinct, which teaches a man to avoid the fire; as much as that, which teaches a bird, with such exactness, the art of incubation, and the whole œconomy and order of its nursery.

SECTION 10

SBN 109

Of Miracles

PART 1

1 THERE is, in Dr. TILLOTSON's writings, an argument against the *real presence*, which is as concise, and elegant, and strong as any argument can possibly be supposed against a doctrine, so little worthy of a serious refutation. It is acknowledged on all hands, says that learned prelate, that the authority, either of the scripture or of tradition, is founded merely in the testimony of the apostles, who were eye-witnesses to those miracles of our Saviour, by which he proved his divine mission. Our evidence, then, for the truth of the CHRISTIAN religion is less than the evidence for the truth of our senses; because, even in the first authors of our religion, it was no greater; and it is evident it must diminish in passing from them to their disciples; nor can any one rest such confidence in their testimony, as in the immediate object of his senses. But a weaker evidence can never destroy a stronger; and therefore, were the doctrine of the real presence ever so clearly revealed in scripture, it were directly contrary to the rules of just reasoning to give our assent to it. It contradicts sense, though both the scripture and tradition, on which it is supposed to be built, carry not such evidence with them as sense; when they are considered merely as external evidences, and are not brought home to every one's breast, by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit.

2 Nothing is so convenient as a decisive argument of this kind, which must at least *silence* the most arrogant bigotry and superstition, and free us from their impertinent solicitations. I flatter myself, that I have discovered an argument of a like nature, which, if just, will, with the wise and learned, be an everlasting check to all kinds of superstitious delusion, and consequently, will be useful as long as the world endures. For so long, I presume, will the accounts of miracles and prodigies be found in all history, sacred and profane.

SBN 110

3 Though experience be our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact; it must be acknowledged, that this guide is not altogether infallible, but in some cases is apt to lead us into errors. One, who, in our climate, should expect better weather in any week of JUNE than in one of DECEMBER, would reason justly, and conformably to experience; but it is certain, that he may

happen, in the event, to find himself mistaken. However, we may observe, that, in such a case, he would have no cause to complain of experience; because it commonly informs us before-hand of the uncertainty, by that contrariety of events, which we may learn from a diligent observation. All effects follow not with like certainty from their supposed causes. Some events are found, in all countries and all ages, to have been constantly conjoined together: Others are found to have been more variable, and sometimes to disappoint our expectations; so that, in our reasonings concerning matter of fact, there are all imaginable degrees of assurance, from the highest certainty to the lowest species of moral evidence.

4 A wise man, therefore, proportions his belief to the evidence. In such conclusions as are founded on an infallible experience, he expects the event with the last degree of assurance, and regards his past experience as a full *proof* of the future existence of that event. In other cases, he proceeds with more *SBN 111* caution: He weighs the opposite experiments: He considers which side is supported by the greater number of experiments: To that side he inclines, with doubt and hesitation; and when at last he fixes his judgment, the evidence exceeds not what we properly call *probability*. All probability, then, supposes an opposition of experiments and observations; where the one side is found to overbalance the other, and to produce a degree of evidence, proportioned to the superiority. A hundred instances or experiments on one side, and fifty on another, afford a doubtful expectation of any event; though a hundred uniform experiments, with only one that is contradictory, reasonably beget a pretty strong degree of assurance. In all cases, we must balance the opposite experiments, where they are opposite, and deduct the smaller number from the greater, in order to know the exact force of the superior evidence.

5 To apply these principles to a particular instance; we may observe, that there is no species of reasoning more common, more useful, and even necessary to human life, than that which is derived from the testimony of men, and the reports of eye-witnesses and spectators. This species of reasoning, perhaps, one may deny to be founded on the relation of cause and effect. I shall not dispute about a word. It will be sufficient to observe, that our assurance in any argument of this kind is derived from no other principle than our observation of the veracity of human testimony, and of the usual conformity of facts to the reports of witnesses. It being a general maxim, that no objects have any discoverable connexion together, and that all the inferences, which we can draw from one to another, are founded merely on our experience of their constant and regular conjunction; it is evident, that we ought not to

make an exception to this maxim in favour of human testimony, whose connexion with any event seems, in itself, as little necessary as any other. Were not the memory tenacious to a certain degree; had not men commonly an inclination to truth and a principle of probity; were they not sensible to shame, when detected in a falsehood: Were not these, I say, discovered by *experience* to be qualities, inherent in human nature, we should never repose the least confidence in human testimony. A man delirious, or noted for falsehood and villany, has no manner of authority with us. *SBN 112*

6 And as the evidence, derived from witnesses and human testimony, is founded on past experience, so it varies with the experience, and is regarded either as a *proof* or a *probability*, according as the conjunction between any particular kind of report and any kind of object has been found to be constant or variable. There are a number of circumstances to be taken into consideration in all judgments of this kind; and the ultimate standard, by which we determine all disputes, that may arise concerning them, is always derived from experience and observation. Where this experience is not entirely uniform on any side, it is attended with an unavoidable contrariety in our judgments, and with the same opposition and mutual destruction of argument as in every other kind of evidence. We frequently hesitate concerning the reports of others. We balance the opposite circumstances, which cause any doubt or uncertainty; and when we discover a superiority on any side, we incline to it; but still with a diminution of assurance, in proportion to the force of its antagonist.

7 This contrariety of evidence, in the present case, may be derived from several different causes; from the opposition of contrary testimony; from the character or number of the witnesses; from the manner of their delivering their testimony; or from the union of all these circumstances. We entertain a suspicion concerning any matter of fact, when the witnesses contradict each other; when they are but few, or of a doubtful character; when they have an interest in what they affirm; when they deliver their testimony with hesitation, or on the contrary, with too violent asseverations. There are many other particulars of the same kind, which may diminish or destroy the force of any argument, derived from human testimony. *SBN 113*

8 Suppose, for instance, that the fact, which the testimony endeavours to establish, partakes of the extraordinary and the marvellous; in that case, the evidence, resulting from the testimony, admits of a diminution, greater or less, in proportion as the fact is more or less unusual. The reason, why we place any credit in witnesses and historians, is not derived from any *connexion*, which we perceive *a priori*, between testimony and reality, but because we

are accustomed to find a conformity between them. But when the fact attested is such a one as has seldom fallen under our observation, here is a contest of two opposite experiences; of which the one destroys the other, as far as its force goes, and the superior can only operate on the mind by the force, which remains. The very same principle of experience, which gives us a certain degree of assurance in the testimony of witnesses, gives us also, in this case, another degree of assurance against the fact, which they endeavour to establish; from which contradiction there necessarily arises a counterpoise, and mutual destruction of belief and authority.

9 *I should not believe such a story were it told me by* CATO; was a proverbial saying in ROME, even during the lifetime of that philosophical patriot.[21] The incredibility of a fact, it was allowed, might invalidate so great an authority.

10 The INDIAN prince, who refused to believe the first relations concerning the effects of frost, reasoned justly; and it naturally required very strong testimony to engage his assent to facts, that arose from a state of nature, with which he was unacquainted, and which bore so little analogy to those events, *SBN 114* of which he had had constant and uniform experience. Though they were not contrary to his experience, they were not conformable to it.[22]

11 But in order to encrease the probability against the testimony of witnesses, let us suppose, that the fact, which they affirm, instead of being only marvellous, is really miraculous; and suppose also, that the testimony, considered apart and in itself, amounts to an entire proof; in that case, there is proof against proof, of which the strongest must prevail, but still with a diminution of its force, in proportion to that of its antagonist.

12 A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can

[21] PLUTARCH. in vita CATONIS. *SBN 113*

[22] No INDIAN, it is evident, could have experience that water did not freeze in cold climates. This *SBN 114* is placing nature in a situation quite unknown to him; and it is impossible for him to tell *a priori* what will result from it. It is making a new experiment, the consequence of which is always uncertain. One may sometimes conjecture from analogy what will follow; but still this is but conjecture. And it must be confessed, that, in the present case of freezing, the event follows contrary to the rules of analogy, and is such as a rational INDIAN would not look for. The operations of cold upon water are not gradual, according to the degrees of cold; but whenever it comes to the freezing point, the water passes in a moment, from the utmost liquidity to perfect hardness. Such an event, therefore, may be denominated *extraordinary*, and requires a pretty strong testimony, to render it credible to people in a warm climate: But still it is not *miraculous*, nor contrary to uniform experience of the course of nature in cases where all the circumstances are the same. The inhabitants of SUMATRA have always seen water fluid in their own climate, and the freezing of their rivers ought to be deemed a prodigy: But they never saw water in MUSCOVY during the winter; and therefore they cannot reasonably be positive what would there be the consequence.

possibly be imagined. Why is it more than probable, that all men must die; that lead cannot, of itself, remain suspended in the air; that fire consumes wood, and is extinguished by water; unless it be, that these events are found agreeable to the laws of nature, and there is required a violation of these *SBN 115*
laws, or in other words, a miracle to prevent them? Nothing is esteemed a miracle, if it ever happen in the common course of nature. It is no miracle that a man, seemingly in good health, should die on a sudden; because such a kind of death, though more unusual than any other, has yet been frequently observed to happen. But it is a miracle, that a dead man should come to life; because that has never been observed, in any age or country. There must, 10
therefore, be a uniform experience against every miraculous event, otherwise the event would not merit that appellation. And as a uniform experience amounts to a proof, there is here a direct and full *proof*, from the nature of the fact, against the existence of any miracle; nor can such a proof be destroyed, or the miracle rendered credible, but by an opposite proof, which is superior.[23]

13 The plain consequence is (and it is a general maxim worthy of our attention), "That no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testi- *SBN 116*
mony be of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous, than the fact, which it endeavours to establish: And even in that case, there is a 20
mutual destruction of arguments, and the superior only gives us an assurance suitable to that degree of force, which remains, after deducting the inferior." When any one tells me, that he saw a dead man restored to life, I immediately consider with myself, whether it be more probable, that this person should either deceive or be deceived, or that the fact, which he relates, should really have happened. I weigh the one miracle against the other; and according to the superiority, which I discover, I pronounce my decision, and always reject the greater miracle. If the falsehood of his testimony would be more

[23] Sometimes an event may not, *in itself*, *seem* to be contrary to the laws of nature, and yet, if it *SBN 115*
were real, it might, by reason of some circumstances, be denominated a miracle; because, in *fact*, it is contrary to these laws. Thus if a person, claiming a divine authority, should command a sick person to be well, a healthful man to fall down dead, the clouds to pour rain, the winds to blow, in short, should order many natural events, which immediately follow upon his command; these might justly be esteemed miracles, because they are really, in this case, contrary to the laws of nature. For if any suspicion remain, that the event and command concurred by accident, there is no miracle and no transgression of the laws of nature. If this suspicion be removed, there is evidently a miracle, and a transgression of these laws; because nothing can be more contrary to nature than that the voice or command of a man should have such an influence. A miracle may be accurately defined, *a transgres-* 10
sion of a law of nature by a particular volition of the Deity, or by the interposition of some invisible agent. A miracle may either be discoverable by men or not. This alters not its nature and essence. The raising of a house or ship into the air is a visible miracle. The raising of a feather, when the wind wants ever so little of a force requisite for that purpose, is as real a miracle, though not so sensible with regard to us.

miraculous, than the event which he relates; then, and not till then, can he pretend to command my belief or opinion.

PART 2

14 In the foregoing reasoning we have supposed, that the testimony, upon which a miracle is founded, may possibly amount to an entire proof, and that the falsehood of that testimony would be a real prodigy: But it is easy to show, that we have been a great deal too liberal in our concession, and that there never was a miraculous event established on so full an evidence.

15 For *first*, there is not to be found, in all history, any miracle attested by a sufficient number of men, of such unquestioned good sense, education, and learning, as to secure us against all delusion in themselves; of such undoubted integrity, as to place them beyond all suspicion of any design to deceive others; of such credit and reputation in the eyes of mankind, as to have a great deal to lose in case of their being detected in any falsehood; and at the same time, attesting facts, performed in such a public manner, and in so celebrated a part of the world, as to render the detection unavoidable: All *SBN 117* which circumstances are requisite to give us a full assurance in the testimony of men.

16 *Secondly*, We may observe in human nature a principle, which, if strictly examined, will be found to diminish extremely the assurance, which we might, from human testimony, have, in any kind of prodigy. The maxim, by which we commonly conduct ourselves in our reasonings, is, that the objects, of which we have no experience, resemble those, of which we have; that what we have found to be most usual is always most probable; and that where there is an opposition of arguments, we ought to give the preference to such as are founded on the greatest number of past observations. But though, in proceeding by this rule, we readily reject any fact which is unusual and incredible in an ordinary degree; yet in advancing farther, the mind observes not always the same rule; but when any thing is affirmed utterly absurd and miraculous, it rather the more readily admits of such a fact, upon account of that very circumstance, which ought to destroy all its authority. The passion of *surprize* and *wonder*, arising from miracles, being an agreeable emotion, gives a sensible tendency towards the belief of those events, from which it is derived. And this goes so far, that even those who cannot enjoy this pleasure immediately, nor can believe those miraculous events, of which they are informed, yet love to partake of the satisfaction at second-

hand or by rebound, and place a pride and delight in exciting the admiration of others.

17 With what greediness are the miraculous accounts of travellers received, their descriptions of sea and land monsters, their relations of wonderful adventures, strange men, and uncouth manners? But if the spirit of religion join itself to the love of wonder, there is an end of common sense; and human testimony, in these circumstances, loses all pretensions to authority. A religionist may be an enthusiast, and imagine he sees what has no reality: He may know his narrative to be false, and yet persevere in it, with the best intentions *SBN 118* in the world, for the sake of promoting so holy a cause: Or even where this 10 delusion has no place, vanity, excited by so strong a temptation, operates on him more powerfully than on the rest of mankind in any other circumstances; and self-interest with equal force. His auditors may not have, and commonly have not, sufficient judgment to canvass his evidence: What judgment they have, they renounce by principle, in these sublime and mysterious subjects: Or if they were ever so willing to employ it, passion and a heated imagination disturb the regularity of its operations. Their credulity encreases his impudence: And his impudence overpowers their credulity.

18 Eloquence, when at its highest pitch, leaves little room for reason or reflection; but addressing itself entirely to the fancy or the affections, captivates 20 the willing hearers, and subdues their understanding. Happily, this pitch it seldom attains. But what a TULLY or a DEMOSTHENES could scarcely effect over a ROMAN or ATHENIAN audience, every *Capuchin*, every itinerant or stationary teacher can perform over the generality of mankind, and in a higher degree, by touching such gross and vulgar passions.

19 The many instances of forged miracles, and prophecies, and supernatural events, which, in all ages, have either been detected by contrary evidence, or which detect themselves by their absurdity, prove sufficiently the strong propensity of mankind to the extraordinary and the marvellous, and ought reasonably to beget a suspicion against all relations of this kind. This is our 30 natural way of thinking, even with regard to the most common and most credible events. For instance: There is no kind of report, which rises so easily, and spreads so quickly, especially in country places and provincial towns, as those concerning marriages; insomuch that two young persons of equal condition never see each other twice, but the whole neighbourhood immediately *SBN 119* join them together. The pleasure of telling a piece of news so interesting, of propagating it, and of being the first reporters of it, spreads the intelligence. And this is so well known, that no man of sense gives attention to these reports, till he find them confirmed by some greater evidence. Do not the

same passions, and others still stronger, incline the generality of mankind to believe and report, with the greatest vehemence and assurance, all religious miracles?

Thirdly, It forms a strong presumption against all supernatural and miraculous relations, that they are observed chiefly to abound among ignorant and barbarous nations; or if a civilized people has ever given admission to any of them, that people will be found to have received them from ignorant and barbarous ancestors, who transmitted them with that inviolable sanction and authority, which always attend received opinions. When we peruse the first histories of all nations, we are apt to imagine ourselves transported into some new world; where the whole frame of nature is disjointed, and every element performs its operations in a different manner, from what it does at present. Battles, revolutions, pestilence, famine, and death, are never the effects of those natural causes, which we experience. Prodigies, omens, oracles, judgments, quite obscure the few natural events, that are intermingled with them. But as the former grow thinner every page, in proportion as we advance nearer the enlightened ages, we soon learn, that there is nothing mysterious or supernatural in the case, but that all proceeds from the usual propensity of mankind towards the marvellous, and that, though this inclination may at intervals receive a check from sense and learning, it can never be thoroughly extirpated from human nature.

It is strange, a judicious reader is apt to say, upon the perusal of these wonderful historians, *that such prodigious events never happen in our days*. But it is nothing strange, I hope, that men should lie in all ages. You must surely have seen instances enow of that frailty. You have yourself heard many such marvellous relations started, which, being treated with scorn by all the wise and judicious, have at last been abandoned even by the vulgar. Be assured, that those renowned lies, which have spread and flourished to such a monstrous height, arose from like beginnings; but being sown in a more proper soil, shot up at last into prodigies almost equal to those which they relate. *SBN 120*

It was a wise policy in that false prophet, Alexander, who, though now forgotten, was once so famous, to lay the first scene of his impostures in Paphlagonia, where, as Lucian tells us, the people were extremely ignorant and stupid, and ready to swallow even the grossest delusion. People at a distance, who are weak enough to think the matter at all worth enquiry, have no opportunity of receiving better information. The stories come magnified to them by a hundred circumstances. Fools are industrious in propagating the imposture; while the wise and learned are contented, in general, to deride its absurdity, without informing themselves of the particular facts, by which it may be distinctly refuted. And thus the impostor above-mentioned was

enabled to proceed, from his ignorant PAPHLAGONIANS, to the enlisting of votaries, even among the GRECIAN philosophers, and men of the most eminent rank and distinction in ROME: Nay, could engage the attention of that sage emperor MARCUS AURELIUS; so far as to make him trust the success of a military expedition to his delusive prophecies.

23 The advantages are so great, of starting an imposture among an ignorant people, that, even though the delusion should be too gross to impose on the generality of them (*which, though seldom, is sometimes the case*) it has a much better chance for succeeding in remote countries, than if the first scene had been laid in a city renowned for arts and knowledge. The most ignorant and *SBN 121* barbarous of these barbarians carry the report abroad. None of their countrymen have a large correspondence, or sufficient credit and authority to contradict and beat down the delusion. Men's inclination to the marvellous has full opportunity to display itself. And thus a story, which is universally exploded in the place where it was first started, shall pass for certain at a thousand miles distance. But had ALEXANDER fixed his residence at ATHENS, the philosophers of that renowned mart of learning had immediately spread, throughout the whole ROMAN empire, their sense of the matter; which, being supported by so great authority, and displayed by all the force of reason and eloquence, had entirely opened the eyes of mankind. It is true; LUCIAN, 20 passing by chance through PAPHLAGONIA, had an opportunity of performing this good office. But, though much to be wished, it does not always happen, that every ALEXANDER meets with a LUCIAN, ready to expose and detect his impostures.

24 I may add as a *fourth* reason, which diminishes the authority of prodigies, that there is no testimony for any, even those which have not been expressly detected, that is not opposed by an infinite number of witnesses; so that not only the miracle destroys the credit of the testimony, but the testimony destroys itself. To make this the better understood, let us consider, that, in matters of religion, whatever is different is contrary; and that it is impossible 30 the religions of ancient ROME, of TURKEY, of SIAM, and of CHINA should, all of them, be established on any solid foundation. Every miracle, therefore, pretended to have been wrought in any of these religions (and all of them abound in miracles), as its direct scope is to establish the particular system to which it is attributed; so has it the same force, though more indirectly, to overthrow every other system. In destroying a rival system, it likewise destroys the credit of those miracles, on which that system was established; *SBN 122* so that all the prodigies of different religions are to be regarded as contrary facts, and the evidences of these prodigies, whether weak or strong, as opposite to each other. According to this method of reasoning, when we believe 40

any miracle of Mahomet or his successors, we have for our warrant the testimony of a few barbarous Arabians: And on the other hand, we are to regard the authority of Titus Livius, Plutarch, Tacitus, and, in short, of all the authors and witnesses, Grecian, Chinese, and Roman Catholic, who have related any miracle in their particular religion; I say, we are to regard their testimony in the same light as if they had mentioned that Mahometan miracle, and had in express terms contradicted it, with the same certainty as they have for the miracle they relate. This argument may appear over subtile and refined; but is not in reality different from the reasoning of a judge, who supposes, that the credit of two witnesses, maintaining a crime against any one, is destroyed by the testimony of two others, who affirm him to have been two hundred leagues distant, at the same instant when the crime is said to have been committed.

One of the best attested miracles in all profane history, is that which Tacitus reports of Vespasian, who cured a blind man in Alexandria, by means of his spittle, and a lame man by the mere touch of his foot; in obedience to a vision of the god Serapis, who had enjoined them to have recourse to the emperor, for these miraculous cures. The story may be seen in that fine historian;[24] where every circumstance seems to add weight to the testimony, and might be displayed at large with all the force of argument and eloquence, if any one were now concerned to enforce the evidence of that exploded and idolatrous superstition. The gravity, solidity, age, and probity *SBN 123* of so great an emperor, who, through the whole course of his life, conversed in a familiar manner with his friends and courtiers, and never affected those extraordinary airs of divinity assumed by Alexander and Demetrius. The historian, a cotemporary writer, noted for candour and veracity, and withal, the greatest and most penetrating genius, perhaps, of all antiquity; and so free from any tendency to credulity, that he even lies under the contrary imputation, of atheism and profaneness: The persons, from whose authority he related the miracle, of established character for judgment and veracity, as we may well presume; eye-witnesses of the fact, and confirming their testimony, after the Flavian family was despoiled of the empire, and could no longer give any reward, as the price of a lie. "Utrumque, qui interfuere, nunc quoque memorant, postquam nullum mendacio pretium." To which if we add the public nature of the facts, as related, it will appear, that no evidence can well be supposed stronger for so gross and so palpable a falsehood.

There is also a memorable story related by Cardinal de Retz, which may

[24] Hist. lib. 4. cap. 81. Suetonius gives nearly the same account, in vita Vesp. *SBN 122*

well deserve our consideration. When that intriguing politician fled into SPAIN, to avoid the persecution of his enemies, he passed through SARAGOSSA, the capital of ARRAGON, where he was shown, in the cathedral, a man, who had served seven years as a door-keeper, and was well known to every body in town, that had ever paid his devotions at that church. He had been seen, for so long a time, wanting a leg; but recovered that limb by the rubbing of holy oil upon the stump; and the cardinal assures us that he saw him with two legs. This miracle was vouched by all the canons of the church; and the whole company in town were appealed to for a confirmation of the fact; whom the cardinal found, by their zealous devotion, to be thorough believers of the miracle. Here the relater was also cotemporary to the supposed prodigy, of an incredulous and libertine character, as well as of great genius; the miracle of so *singular* a nature as could scarcely admit of a counterfeit, and the witnesses very numerous, and all of them, in a manner, spectators of the fact, to which they gave their testimony. And what adds mightily to the force of the evidence, and may double our surprize on this occasion, is, that the cardinal himself, who relates the story, seems not to give any credit to it, and consequently cannot be suspected of any concurrence in the holy fraud. He considered justly, that it was not requisite, in order to reject a fact of this nature, to be able accurately to disprove the testimony, and to trace its falsehood, through all the circumstances of knavery and credulity which produced it. He knew, that, as this was commonly altogether impossible at any small distance of time and place; so was it extremely difficult, even where one was immediately present, by reason of the bigotry, ignorance, cunning, and roguery of a great part of mankind. He therefore concluded, like a just reasoner, that such an evidence carried falsehood upon the very face of it, and that a miracle, supported by any human testimony, was more properly a subject of derision than of argument. *SBN 124*

27 There surely never was a greater number of miracles ascribed to one person, than those, which were lately said to have been wrought in FRANCE upon the tomb of Abbé PARIS, the famous JANSENIST, with whose sanctity the people were so long deluded. The curing of the sick, giving hearing to the deaf, and sight to the blind, were every where talked of as the usual effects of that holy sepulchre. But what is more extraordinary; many of the miracles were immediately proved upon the spot, before judges of unquestioned integrity, attested by witnesses of credit and distinction, in a learned age, and on the most eminent theatre that is now in the world. Nor is this all: A relation of them was published and dispersed every where; nor were the JESUITS, though a learned body, supported by the civil magistrate, and determined enemies to those opinions, in whose favour the miracles were said to have *SBN 125*

been wrought, ever able distinctly to refute or detect them.[25] Where shall we find such a number of circumstances, agreeing to the corroboration of one fact? And what have we to oppose to such a cloud of witnesses, but the absolute impossibility or miraculous nature of the events, which they relate? And this surely, in the eyes of all reasonable people, will alone be regarded as a sufficient refutation.

[25] This book was writ by Mons. MONTGERON, counsellor or judge of the parliament of PARIS, a man of figure and character, who was also a martyr to the cause, and is now said to be somewhere in a dungeon on account of his book. *SBN 344*

There is another book in three volumes (called *Recueil des Miracles de l'Abbé* PARIS) giving an account of many of these miracles, and accompanied with prefatory discourses, which are very well written. There runs, however, through the whole of these a ridiculous comparison between the miracles of our Saviour and those of the Abbé; wherein it is asserted, that the evidence for the latter is equal to that for the former: As if the testimony of men could ever be put in the balance with that of God himself, who conducted the pen of the inspired writers. If these writers, indeed, were to be considered merely as human testimony, the FRENCH author is very moderate in his comparison; since he might, with some appearance of reason, pretend, that the JANSENIST miracles much surpass the other in evidence and authority. The following circumstances are drawn from authentic papers, inserted in the above-mentioned book.

Many of the miracles of Abbé PARIS were proved immediately by witnesses before the officiality or bishop's court at PARIS, under the eye of Cardinal NOAILLES, whose character for integrity and capacity was never contested even by his enemies.

His successor in the archbishopric was an enemy to the JANSENISTS, and for that reason promoted to the see by the court. Yet 22 rectors or *curés* of PARIS, with infinite earnestness, press him to examine those miracles, which they assert to be known to the whole world, and undisputably certain: But he wisely forbore.

The MOLINIST party had tried to discredit these miracles in one instance, that of Mademoiselle LE FRANC. But, besides that their proceedings were in many respects the most irregular in the world, particularly in citing only a few of the JANSENIST witnesses, whom they tampered with: Besides this, I say, they soon found themselves overwhelmed by a cloud of new witnesses, one hundred and twenty in number, most of them persons of credit and substance in PARIS, who gave oath for the miracle. This was accompanied with a solemn and earnest appeal to the parliament. But the parliament were forbid by authority to meddle in the affair. It was at last observed, that where men are heated by zeal and enthusiasm, there is no degree of human testimony so strong as may not be procured for the greatest absurdity: And those who will be so silly as to examine the affair by that medium, and seek particular flaws in the testimony, are almost sure to be confounded. It must be a miserable imposture, indeed, that does not prevail in that contest. *SBN 345*

All who have been in FRANCE about that time have heard of the reputation of Mons. HERAULT, the *Lieutenant de Police*, whose vigilance, penetration, activity, and extensive intelligence have been much talked of. This magistrate, who by the nature of his office is almost absolute, was invested with full powers, on purpose to suppress or discredit these miracles; and he frequently seized immediately, and examined the witnesses and subjects of them: But never could reach any thing satisfactory against them.

In the case of Mademoiselle THIBAULT he sent the famous DE SYLVA to examine her; whose evidence is very curious. The physician declares, that it was impossible she could have been so ill as was proved by witnesses; because it was impossible she could, in so short a time, have recovered so perfectly as he found her. He reasoned, like a man of sense, from natural causes; but the opposite party told him, that the whole was a miracle, and that his evidence was the very best proof of it.

The MOLINISTS were in a sad dilemma. They durst not assert the absolute insufficiency of human evidence, to prove a miracle. They were obliged to say, that these miracles were wrought by witchcraft and the devil. But they were told, that this was the resource of the JEWS of old.

28 Is the consequence just, because some human testimony has the utmost force and authority in some cases, when it relates the battle of PHILIPPI or PHARSALIA for instance; that therefore all kinds of testimony must, in all cases, have equal force and authority? Suppose that the CÆSAREAN and POMPEIAN factions had, each of them, claimed the victory in these battles, and that the historians of each party had uniformly ascribed the advantage to their own side; how could mankind, at this distance, have been able to determine between them? The contrariety is equally strong between the miracles related by HERODOTUS or PLUTARCH, and those delivered by MARIANA, BEDE, or any monkish historian.

29 The wise lend a very academic faith to every report which favours the passion of the reporter; whether it magnifies his country, his family, or himself, or in any other way strikes in with his natural inclinations and propensities. But what greater temptation than to appear a missionary, a prophet, an ambassador from heaven? Who would not encounter many

No JANSENIST was ever embarrassed to account for the cessation of the miracles, when the church-yard was shut up by the king's edict. It was the touch of the tomb, which produced these extraordinary effects; and when no one could approach the tomb, no effects could be expected. God, indeed, could have thrown down the walls in a moment; but he is master of his own graces and works, and it belongs not to us to account for them. He did not throw down the walls of every city like those of JERICHO, on the sounding of the rams horns, nor break up the prison of every apostle, like that of ST. PAUL. *SBN 346*

No less a man, than the Duc de CHATILLON, a duke and peer of FRANCE, of the highest rank and family, gives evidence of a miraculous cure, performed upon a servant of his, who had lived several years in his house with a visible and palpable infirmity.

I shall conclude with observing, that no clergy are more celebrated for strictness of life and manners than the secular clergy of FRANCE, particularly the rectors or *curés* of PARIS, who bear testimony to these impostures.

The learning, genius, and probity of the gentlemen, and the austerity of the nuns of PORT-ROYAL, have been much celebrated all over EUROPE. Yet they all give evidence for a miracle, wrought on the niece of the famous PASCAL, whose sanctity of life, as well as extraordinary capacity, is well known. The famous RACINE gives an account of this miracle in his famous history of PORT-ROYAL, and fortifies it with all the proofs, which a multitude of nuns, priests, physicians, and men of the world, all of them of undoubted credit, could bestow upon it. Several men of letters, particularly the bishop of TOURNAY, thought this miracle so certain, as to employ it in the refutation of atheists and free-thinkers. The queen-regent of FRANCE, who was extremely prejudiced against the PORT-ROYAL, sent her own physician to examine the miracle, who returned an absolute convert. In short, the supernatural cure was so incontestable, that it saved, for a time, that famous monastery from the ruin with which it was threatened by the JESUITS. Had it been a cheat, it had certainly been detected by such sagacious and powerful antagonists, and must have hastened the ruin of the contrivers. Our divines, who can build up a formidable castle from such despicable materials; what a prodigious fabric could they have reared from these and many other circumstances, which I have not mentioned! How often would the great names of PASCAL, RACINE, ARNAULD, NICOLE, have resounded in our ears? But if they be wise, they had better adopt the miracle, as being more worth, a thousand times, than all the rest of their collection. Besides, it may serve very much to their purpose. For that miracle was really performed by the touch of an authentic holy prickle of the holy thorn, which composed the holy crown, which, *&c.*

dangers and difficulties, in order to attain so sublime a character? Or if, by the help of vanity and a heated imagination, a man has first made a convert of himself, and entered seriously into the delusion; who ever scruples to make use of pious frauds, in support of so holy and meritorious a cause?

30 The smallest spark may here kindle into the greatest flame; because the *SBN 126*
materials are always prepared for it. The *avidum genus auricularum*,[26] the gazing populace, receive greedily, without examination, whatever sooths superstition, and promotes wonder.

31 How many stories of this nature have, in all ages, been detected and exploded in their infancy? How many more have been celebrated for a time, 10
and have afterwards sunk into neglect and oblivion? Where such reports, therefore, fly about, the solution of the phænomenon is obvious; and we judge in conformity to regular experience and observation, when we account for it by the known and natural principles of credulity and delusion. And shall we, rather than have a recourse to so natural a solution, allow of a miraculous violation of the most established laws of nature?

32 I need not mention the difficulty of detecting a falsehood in any private or even public history, at the place, where it is said to happen; much more when the scene is removed to ever so small a distance. Even a court of judicature, with all the authority, accuracy, and judgment, which they can employ, find 20
themselves often at a loss to distinguish between truth and falsehood in the most recent actions. But the matter never comes to any issue, if trusted to the common method of altercation and debate and flying rumours; especially when men's passions have taken part on either side.

33 In the infancy of new religions, the wise and learned commonly esteem the matter too inconsiderable to deserve their attention or regard. And when afterwards they would willingly detect the cheat, in order to undeceive the deluded multitude, the season is now past, and the records and witnesses, which might clear up the matter, have perished beyond recovery.

34 No means of detection remain, but those which must be drawn from the *SBN 127*
very testimony itself of the reporters: And these, though always sufficient with the judicious and knowing, are commonly too fine to fall under the comprehension of the vulgar.

35 Upon the whole, then, it appears, that no testimony for any kind of miracle has ever amounted to a probability, much less to a proof; and that, even supposing it amounted to a proof, it would be opposed by another proof; derived from the very nature of the fact, which it would endeavour to establish. It is experience only, which gives authority to human testimony; and it is the same

[26] Lucret. *SBN 126*

experience, which assures us of the laws of nature. When, therefore, these two kinds of experience are contrary, we have nothing to do but subtract the one from the other, and embrace an opinion, either on one side or the other, with that assurance which arises from the remainder. But according to the principle here explained, this subtraction, with regard to all popular religions, amounts to an entire annihilation; and therefore we may establish it as a maxim, that no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle, and make it a just foundation for any such system of religion.

36 I beg the limitations here made may be remarked, when I say, that a miracle can never be proved, so as to be the foundation of a system of religion. For I own, that otherwise, there may possibly be miracles, or violations of the usual course of nature, of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony; though, perhaps, it will be impossible to find any such in all the records of history. Thus, suppose, all authors, in all languages, agree, that, from the first of JANUARY 1600, there was a total darkness over the whole earth for eight days: Suppose that the tradition of this extraordinary event is still strong and lively among the people: That all travellers, who return from foreign countries, bring us accounts of the same tradition, without the least variation or *SBN 128* contradiction: It is evident, that our present philosophers, instead of doubting the fact, ought to receive it as certain, and ought to search for the causes whence it might be derived. The decay, corruption, and dissolution of nature, is an event rendered probable by so many analogies, that any phænomenon, which seems to have a tendency towards that catastrophe, comes within the reach of human testimony, if that testimony be very extensive and uniform.

37 But suppose, that all the historians, who treat of ENGLAND, should agree, that, on the first of JANUARY 1600, Queen ELIZABETH died; that both before and after her death she was seen by her physicians and the whole court, as is usual with persons of her rank; that her successor was acknowledged and proclaimed by the parliament; and that, after being interred a month, she again appeared, resumed the throne, and governed ENGLAND for three years: I must confess that I should be surprized at the concurrence of so many odd circumstances, but should not have the least inclination to believe so miraculous an event. I should not doubt of her pretended death, and of those other public circumstances that followed it: I should only assert it to have been pretended, and that it neither was, nor possibly could be real. You would in vain object to me the difficulty, and almost impossibility of deceiving the world in an affair of such consequence; the wisdom and solid judgment of that renowned queen; with the little or no advantage which she could reap from so poor an artifice: All this might astonish me; but I would still reply, that the

knavery and folly of men are such common phænomena, that I should rather believe the most extraordinary events to arise from their concurrence, than admit of so signal a violation of the laws of nature.

38 But should this miracle be ascribed to any new system of religion; men, in all ages, have been so much imposed on by ridiculous stories of that kind, that *SBN 129* this very circumstance would be a full proof of a cheat, and sufficient, with all men of sense, not only to make them reject the fact, but even reject it without farther examination. Though the Being, to whom the miracle is ascribed, be, in this case, Almighty, it does not, upon that account, become a whit more probable; since it is impossible for us to know the attributes or actions of such a Being, otherwise than from the experience which we have of his productions, in the usual course of nature. This still reduces us to past observation, and obliges us to compare the instances of the violations of truth in the testimony of men with those of the violation of the laws of nature by miracles, in order to judge which of them is most likely and probable. As the violations of truth are more common in the testimony concerning religious miracles, than in that concerning any other matter of fact; this must diminish very much the authority of the former testimony, and make us form a general resolution, never to lend any attention to it, with whatever specious pretence it may be covered.

39 Lord Bacon seems to have embraced the same principles of reasoning. "We ought," says he, "to make a collection or particular history of all monsters and prodigious births or productions, and in a word of every thing new, rare, and extraordinary in nature. But this must be done with the most severe scrutiny, lest we depart from truth. Above all, every relation must be considered as suspicious, which depends in any degree upon religion, as the prodigies of Livy: And no less so, every thing that is to be found in the writers of natural magic or alchimy, or such authors, who seem, all of them, to have an unconquerable appetite for falsehood and fable."[27]

40 I am the better pleased with the method of reasoning here delivered, as I think it may serve to confound those dangerous friends or disguised enemies *SBN 130* to the Christian religion, who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason. Our most holy religion is founded on *Faith*, not on reason; and it is a sure method of exposing it to put it to such a trial as it is, by no means, fitted to endure. To make this more evident, let us examine those miracles, related in scripture; and not to lose ourselves in too wide a field, let us confine ourselves to such as we find in the *Pentateuch*, which we shall examine, according to the principles of these pretended Christians, not as

[27] Nov. Org. lib. 2. aph. 29. *SBN 129*

the word or testimony of God himself, but as the production of a mere human writer and historian. Here then we are first to consider a book, presented to us by a barbarous and ignorant people, written in an age when they were still more barbarous, and in all probability long after the facts which it relates, corroborated by no concurring testimony, and resembling those fabulous accounts, which every nation gives of its origin. Upon reading this book, we find it full of prodigies and miracles. It gives an account of a state of the world and of human nature entirely different from the present: Of our fall from that state: Of the age of man, extended to near a thousand years: Of the destruction of the world by a deluge: Of the arbitrary choice of one people, as the favourites of heaven; and that people the countrymen of the author: Of their deliverance from bondage by prodigies the most astonishing imaginable: I desire any one to lay his hand upon his heart, and after serious consideration declare, whether he thinks that the falsehood of such a book, supported by such a testimony, would be more extraordinary and miraculous than all the miracles it relates; which is, however, necessary to make it be received, according to the measures of probability above established.

41 What we have said of miracles may be applied, without any variation, to prophecies; and indeed, all prophecies are real miracles, and as such only, can be admitted as proofs of any revelation. If it did not exceed the capacity of human nature to foretel future events, it would be absurd to employ any prophecy as an argument for a divine mission or authority from heaven. So that, upon the whole, we may conclude, that the CHRISTIAN religion not only was at first attended with miracles, but even at this day cannot be believed by any reasonable person without one. Mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity: And whoever is moved by *Faith* to assent to it, is conscious of a continued miracle in his own person, which subverts all the principles of his understanding, and gives him a determination to believe what is most contrary to custom and experience.

SBN 131

SECTION 11

SBN 132

Of a Particular Providence and of a Future State

1 I WAS lately engaged in conversation with a friend who loves sceptical paradoxes; where, though he advanced many principles, of which I can by no means approve, yet as they seem to be curious, and to bear some relation to the chain of reasoning carried on throughout this enquiry, I shall here copy them from my memory as accurately as I can, in order to submit them to the judgment of the reader.

2 Our conversation began with my admiring the singular good fortune of philosophy, which, as it requires entire liberty above all other privileges, and chiefly flourishes from the free opposition of sentiments and argumentation, received its first birth in an age and country of freedom and toleration, and was never cramped, even in its most extravagant principles, by any creeds, confessions, or penal statutes. For, except the banishment of PROTAGORAS, and the death of SOCRATES, which last event proceeded partly from other motives, there are scarcely any instances to be met with, in ancient history, of this bigotted jealousy, with which the present age is so much infested. EPICURUS lived at ATHENS to an advanced age, in peace and tranquillity: EPICUREANS[28] were even admitted to receive the sacerdotal character, and to officiate at the altar, in the most sacred rites of the established religion: And the public encouragement[29] of pensions and salaries was afforded equally, by *SBN 133* the wisest of all the ROMAN emperors,[30] to the professors of every sect of philosophy. How requisite such kind of treatment was to philosophy, in her early youth, will easily be conceived, if we reflect, that, even at present, when she may be supposed more hardy and robust, she bears with much difficulty the inclemency of the seasons, and those harsh winds of calumny and persecution, which blow upon her.

3 You admire, says my friend, as the singular good fortune of philosophy, what seems to result from the natural course of things, and to be unavoidable in every age and nation. This pertinacious bigotry, of which you complain, as so fatal to philosophy, is really her offspring, who, after allying with superstition, separates himself entirely from the interest of his parent, and becomes her most inveterate enemy and persecutor. Speculative dogmas of religion,

[28] LUCIAN. *συμπ. ἢ Λαπίθαι.* [29] LUCIAN. *εὐνοῦχος.* [30] Id. & DIO.

the present occasions of such furious dispute, could not possibly be conceived or admitted in the early ages of the world; when mankind, being wholly illiterate, formed an idea of religion more suitable to their weak apprehension, and composed their sacred tenets of such tales chiefly as were the objects of traditional belief, more than of argument or disputation. After the first alarm, therefore, was over, which arose from the new paradoxes and principles of the philosophers; these teachers seem ever after, during the ages of antiquity, to have lived in great harmony with the established superstition, and to have made a fair partition of mankind between them; the former claiming all the learned and wise, the latter possessing all the vulgar and illiterate.

4 It seems then, say I, that you leave politics entirely out of the question, and never suppose, that a wise magistrate can justly be jealous of certain tenets of philosophy, such as those of EPICURUS, which, denying a divine existence, and consequently a providence and a future state, seem to loosen, in a great measure, the ties of morality, and may be supposed, for that reason, pernicious to the peace of civil society. *SBN 134*

5 I know, replied he, that in fact these persecutions never, in any age, proceeded from calm reason, or from experience of the pernicious consequences of philosophy; but arose entirely from passion and prejudice. But what if I should advance farther, and assert, that, if EPICURUS had been accused before the people, by any of the *sycophants* or informers of those days, he could easily have defended his cause, and proved his principles of philosophy to be as salutary as those of his adversaries, who endeavoured, with such zeal, to expose him to the public hatred and jealousy?

6 I wish, said I, you would try your eloquence upon so extraordinary a topic, and make a speech for EPICURUS, which might satisfy, not the mob of ATHENS, if you will allow that ancient and polite city to have contained any mob, but the more philosophical part of his audience, such as might be supposed capable of comprehending his arguments.

7 The matter would not be difficult, upon such conditions, replied he: And if you please, I shall suppose myself EPICURUS for a moment, and make you stand for the ATHENIAN people, and shall deliver you such an harangue as will fill all the urn with white beans, and leave not a black one to gratify the malice of my adversaries.

8 Very well: Pray proceed upon these suppositions.

9 I come hither, O ye ATHENIANS, to justify in your assembly what I maintained in my school, and I find myself impeached by furious antagonists, instead of reasoning with calm and dispassionate enquirers. Your deliberations, which of right should be directed to questions of public good, and the

interest of the commonwealth, are diverted to the disquisitions of speculative philosophy; and these magnificent, but perhaps fruitless enquiries, take place of your more familiar but more useful occupations. But so far as in me *SBN 135*
lies, I will prevent this abuse. We shall not here dispute concerning the origin and government of worlds. We shall only enquire how far such questions concern the public interest. And if I can persuade you, that they are entirely indifferent to the peace of society and security of government, I hope that you will presently send us back to our schools, there to examine, at leisure, the question, the most sublime, but, at the same time, the most speculative of all philosophy.

10 The religious philosophers, not satisfied with the tradition of your forefathers, and doctrine of your priests (in which I willingly acquiesce), indulge a rash curiosity, in trying how far they can establish religion upon the principles of reason; and they thereby excite, instead of satisfying, the doubts, which naturally arise from a diligent and scrutinous enquiry. They paint, in the most magnificent colours, the order, beauty, and wise arrangement of the universe; and then ask, if such a glorious display of intelligence could proceed from the fortuitous concourse of atoms, or if chance could produce what the greatest genius can never sufficiently admire. I shall not examine the justness of this argument. I shall allow it to be as solid as my antagonists and
accusers can desire. It is sufficient, if I can prove, from this very reasoning, that the question is entirely speculative, and that, when, in my philosophical disquisitions, I deny a providence and a future state, I undermine not the foundations of society, but advance principles, which they themselves, upon their own topics, if they argue consistently, must allow to be solid and satisfactory.

11 You then, who are my accusers, have acknowledged, that the chief or sole argument for a divine existence (which I never questioned) is derived from the order of nature; where there appear such marks of intelligence and design, that you think it extravagant to assign for its cause, either chance, or
the blind and unguided force of matter. You allow, that this is an argument *SBN 136*
drawn from effects to causes. From the order of the work, you infer, that there must have been project and forethought in the workman. If you cannot make out this point, you allow, that your conclusion fails; and you pretend not to establish the conclusion in a greater latitude than the phænomena of nature will justify. These are your concessions. I desire you to mark the consequences.

12 When we infer any particular cause from an effect, we must proportion the one to the other, and can never be allowed to ascribe to the cause any qualities, but what are exactly sufficient to produce the effect. A body of ten ounces

raised in any scale may serve as a proof, that the counterbalancing weight exceeds ten ounces; but can never afford a reason that it exceeds a hundred. If the cause, assigned for any effect, be not sufficient to produce it, we must either reject that cause, or add to it such qualities as will give it a just proportion to the effect. But if we ascribe to it farther qualities, or affirm it capable of producing other effects, we can only indulge the licence of conjecture, and arbitrarily suppose the existence of qualities and energies, without reason or authority.

13 The same rule holds, whether the cause assigned be brute unconscious matter, or a rational intelligent being. If the cause be known only by the effect, we never ought to ascribe to it any qualities, beyond what are precisely requisite to produce the effect: Nor can we, by any rules of just reasoning, return back from the cause, and infer other effects from it, beyond those by which alone it is known to us. No one, merely from the sight of one of ZEUXIS's pictures, could know, that he was also a statuary or architect, and was an artist no less skilful in stone and marble than in colours. The talents and taste, displayed in the particular work before us; these we may safely conclude the workman to be possessed of. The cause must be proportioned to the effect; and if we exactly and precisely proportion it, we shall never *SBN 137* find in it any qualities, that point farther, or afford an inference concerning any other design or performance. Such qualities must be somewhat beyond what is merely requisite for producing the effect, which we examine.

14 Allowing, therefore, the gods to be the authors of the existence or order of the universe; it follows, that they possess that precise degree of power, intelligence, and benevolence, which appears in their workmanship; but nothing farther can ever be proved, except we call in the assistance of exaggeration and flattery to supply the defects of argument and reasoning. So far as the traces of any attributes, at present, appear, so far may we conclude these attributes to exist. The supposition of farther attributes is mere hypothesis; much more the supposition, that, in distant regions of space or periods of time, there has been, or will be, a more magnificent display of these attributes, and a scheme of administration more suitable to such imaginary virtues. We can never be allowed to mount up from the universe, the effect, to JUPITER, the cause; and then descend downwards, to infer any new effect from that cause; as if the present effects alone were not entirely worthy of the glorious attributes, which we ascribe to that deity. The knowledge of the cause being derived solely from the effect, they must be exactly adjusted to each other; and the one can never refer to any thing farther, or be the foundation of any new inference and conclusion.

15 You find certain phænomena in nature. You seek a cause or author. You imagine that you have found him. You afterwards become so enamoured of this offspring of your brain, that you imagine it impossible, but he must produce something greater and more perfect than the present scene of things, which is so full of ill and disorder. You forget, that this superlative intelligence and benevolence are entirely imaginary, or, at least, without any foundation in reason; and that you have no ground to ascribe to him any qual- *SBN 138*
ities, but what you see he has actually exerted and displayed in his productions. Let your gods, therefore, O philosophers, be suited to the present appearances of nature: And presume not to alter these appearances by arbi- 10
trary suppositions, in order to suit them to the attributes, which you so fondly ascribe to your deities.

16 When priests and poets, supported by your authority, O ATHENIANS, talk of a golden or silver age, which preceded the present state of vice and misery, I hear them with attention and with reverence. But when philosophers, who pretend to neglect authority, and to cultivate reason, hold the same discourse, I pay them not, I own, the same obsequious submission and pious deference. I ask; who carried them into the celestial regions, who admitted them into the councils of the gods, who opened to them the book of fate, that they thus rashly affirm, that their deities have executed, or will execute, any purpose 20
beyond what has actually appeared? If they tell me, that they have mounted on the steps or by the gradual ascent of reason, and by drawing inferences from effects to causes, I still insist, that they have aided the ascent of reason by the wings of imagination; otherwise they could not thus change their manner of inference, and argue from causes to effects; presuming, that a more perfect production than the present world would be more suitable to such perfect beings as the gods, and forgetting that they have no reason to ascribe to these celestial beings any perfection or any attribute, but what can be found in the present world.

17 Hence all the fruitless industry to account for the ill appearances of nature, 30
and save the honour of the gods; while we must acknowledge the reality of that evil and disorder, with which the world so much abounds. The obstinate and intractable qualities of matter, we are told, or the observance of general *SBN 139*
laws, or some such reason, is the sole cause, which controuled the power and benevolence of JUPITER, and obliged him to create mankind and every sensible creature so imperfect and so unhappy. These attributes, then, are, it seems, before-hand, taken for granted, in their greatest latitude. And upon that supposition, I own, that such conjectures may, perhaps, be admitted as plausible solutions of the ill phænomena. But still I ask; Why take these attributes for granted, or why ascribe to the cause any qualities but 40

what actually appear in the effect? Why torture your brain to justify the course of nature upon suppositions, which, for aught you know, may be entirely imaginary, and of which there are to be found no traces in the course of nature?

18 The religious hypothesis, therefore, must be considered only as a particular method of accounting for the visible phænomena of the universe: But no just reasoner will ever presume to infer from it any single fact, and alter or add to the phænomena, in any single particular. If you think, that the appearances of things prove such causes, it is allowable for you to draw an inference concerning the existence of these causes. In such complicated and sublime subjects, every one should be indulged in the liberty of conjecture and argument. But here you ought to rest. If you come backward, and arguing from your inferred causes, conclude, that any other fact has existed, or will exist, in the course of nature, which may serve as a fuller display of particular attributes; I must admonish you, that you have departed from the method of reasoning, attached to the present subject, and have certainly added something to the attributes of the cause, beyond what appears in the effect; otherwise you could never, with tolerable sense or propriety, add any thing to the effect, in order to render it more worthy of the cause.

19 Where, then, is the odiousness of that doctrine, which I teach in my school, or rather, which I examine in my gardens? Or what do you find in this whole question, wherein the security of good morals, or the peace and order of society is in the least concerned? *SBN 140*

20 I deny a providence, you say, and supreme governor of the world, who guides the course of events, and punishes the vicious with infamy and disappointment, and rewards the virtuous with honour and success, in all their undertakings. But surely, I deny not the course itself of events, which lies open to every one's enquiry and examination. I acknowledge, that, in the present order of things, virtue is attended with more peace of mind than vice, and meets with a more favourable reception from the world. I am sensible, that, according to the past experience of mankind, friendship is the chief joy of human life, and moderation the only source of tranquillity and happiness. I never balance between the virtuous and the vicious course of life; but am sensible, that, to a well disposed mind, every advantage is on the side of the former. And what can you say more, allowing all your suppositions and reasonings? You tell me, indeed, that this disposition of things proceeds from intelligence and design. But whatever it proceeds from, the disposition itself, on which depends our happiness or misery, and consequently our conduct and deportment in life, is still the same. It is still open for me, as well as you, to regulate my behaviour, by my experience of past events. And if you affirm,

that, while a divine providence is allowed, and a supreme distributive justice in the universe, I ought to expect some more particular reward of the good, and punishment of the bad, beyond the ordinary course of events; I here find the same fallacy, which I have before endeavoured to detect. You persist in imagining, that, if we grant that divine existence, for which you so earnestly contend, you may safely infer consequences from it, and add something to *SBN 141*
the experienced order of nature, by arguing from the attributes which you ascribe to your gods. You seem not to remember, that all your reasonings on this subject can only be drawn from effects to causes; and that every argument, deduced from causes to effects, must of necessity be a gross
sophism; since it is impossible for you to know any thing of the cause, but what you have antecedently, not inferred, but discovered to the full, in the effect.

21 But what must a philosopher think of those vain reasoners, who, instead of regarding the present scene of things as the sole object of their contemplation, so far reverse the whole course of nature, as to render this life merely a passage to something farther; a porch, which leads to a greater, and vastly different building; a prologue, which serves only to introduce the piece, and give it more grace and propriety? Whence, do you think, can such philosophers derive their idea of the gods? From their own conceit and imagination surely.
For if they derived it from the present phænomena, it would never point to any thing farther, but must be exactly adjusted to them. That the divinity may *possibly* be endowed with attributes, which we have never seen exerted; may be governed by principles of action, which we cannot discover to be satisfied: All this will freely be allowed. But still this is mere *possibility* and hypothesis. We never can have reason to *infer* any attributes, or any principles of action in him, but so far as we know them to have been exerted and satisfied.

22 *Are there any marks of a distributive justice in the world?* If you answer in the affirmative, I conclude, that, since justice here exerts itself, it is satisfied. If
you reply in the negative, I conclude, that you have then no reason to ascribe justice, in our sense of it, to the gods. If you hold a medium between affirmation and negation, by saying, that the justice of the gods, at present, exerts *SBN 142*
itself in part, but not in its full extent; I answer, that you have no reason to give it any particular extent, but only so far as you see it, *at present*, exert itself.

23 Thus I bring the dispute, O Athenians, to a short issue with my antagonists. The course of nature lies open to my contemplation as well as to theirs. The experienced train of events is the great standard, by which we all regulate our conduct. Nothing else can be appealed to in the field, or in the senate. Nothing else ought ever to be heard of in the school, or in the closet. In vain

would our limited understanding break through those boundaries, which are too narrow for our fond imagination. While we argue from the course of nature, and infer a particular intelligent cause, which first bestowed, and still preserves order in the universe, we embrace a principle, which is both uncertain and useless. It is uncertain; because the subject lies entirely beyond the reach of human experience. It is useless; because our knowledge of this cause being derived entirely from the course of nature, we can never, according to the rules of just reasoning, return back from the cause with any new inference, or making additions to the common and experienced course of nature, establish any new principles of conduct and behaviour.

24 I observe (said I, finding he had finished his harangue) that you neglect not the artifice of the demagogues of old; and as you were pleased to make me stand for the people, you insinuate yourself into my favour by embracing those principles, to which, you know, I have always expressed a particular attachment. But allowing you to make experience (as indeed I think you ought) the only standard of our judgment concerning this, and all other questions of fact; I doubt not but, from the very same experience, to which you appeal, it may be possible to refute this reasoning, which you have put *SBN 143* into the mouth of Epicurus. If you saw, for instance, a half-finished building, surrounded with heaps of brick and stone and mortar, and all the instruments of masonry; could you not *infer* from the effect, that it was a work of design and contrivance? And could you not return again, from this inferred cause, to infer new additions to the effect, and conclude, that the building would soon be finished, and receive all the further improvements, which art could bestow upon it? If you saw upon the sea-shore the print of one human foot, you would conclude, that a man had passed that way, and that he had also left the traces of the other foot, though effaced by the rolling of the sands or inundation of the waters. Why then do you refuse to admit the same method of reasoning with regard to the order of nature? Consider the world and the present life only as an imperfect building, from which you can infer a superior intelligence; and arguing from that superior intelligence, which can leave nothing imperfect; why may you not infer a more finished scheme or plan, which will receive its completion in some distant point of space or time? Are not these methods of reasoning exactly similar? And under what pretence can you embrace the one, while you reject the other?

25 The infinite difference of the subjects, replied he, is a sufficient foundation for this difference in my conclusions. In works of *human* art and contrivance, it is allowable to advance from the effect to the cause, and returning back from the cause, to form new inferences concerning the effect, and examine the alterations, which it has probably undergone, or may still undergo. But what

is the foundation of this method of reasoning? Plainly this; that man is a being, whom we know by experience, whose motives and designs we are acquainted with, and whose projects and inclinations have a certain connexion and coherence, according to the laws which nature has established for the *SBN 144*
government of such a creature. When, therefore, we find, that any work has proceeded from the skill and industry of man; as we are otherwise acquainted with the nature of the animal, we can draw a hundred inferences concerning what may be expected from him; and these inferences will all be founded in experience and observation. But did we know man only from the single work or production which we examine, it were impossible for us to argue in this 10
manner; because our knowledge of all the qualities, which we ascribe to him, being in that case derived from the production, it is impossible they could point to any thing farther, or be the foundation of any new inference. The print of a foot in the sand can only prove, when considered alone, that there was some figure adapted to it, by which it was produced: But the print of a human foot proves likewise, from our other experience, that there was probably another foot, which also left its impression, though effaced by time or other accidents. Here we mount from the effect to the cause; and descending again from the cause, infer alterations in the effect; but this is not a continuation of the same simple chain of reasoning. We comprehend in this case a 20
hundred other experiences and observations, concerning the *usual* figure and members of that species of animal, without which this method of argument must be considered as fallacious and sophistical.

26 The case is not the same with our reasonings from the works of nature. The Deity is known to us only by his productions, and is a single being in the universe, not comprehended under any species or genus, from whose experienced attributes or qualities, we can, by analogy, infer any attribute or quality in him. As the universe shows wisdom and goodness, we infer wisdom and goodness. As it shows a particular degree of these perfections, we infer a par- *SBN 145*
ticular degree of them, precisely adapted to the effect which we examine. But 30
farther attributes or farther degrees of the same attributes, we can never be authorized to infer or suppose, by any rules of just reasoning. Now, without some such licence of supposition, it is impossible for us to argue from the cause, or infer any alteration in the effect, beyond what has immediately fallen under our observation. Greater good produced by this Being must still prove a greater degree of goodness: A more impartial distribution of rewards and punishments must proceed from a greater regard to justice and equity. Every supposed addition to the works of nature makes an addition to the attributes of the Author of nature; and consequently, being entirely unsup-

ported by any reason or argument, can never be admitted but as mere conjecture and hypothesis.[31]

27 The great source of our mistake in this subject, and of the unbounded licence of conjecture, which we indulge, is, that we tacitly consider ourselves, as in the place of the Supreme Being, and conclude, that he will, on every occasion, observe the same conduct, which we ourselves, in his situation, *SBN 146* would have embraced as reasonable and eligible. But, besides that the ordinary course of nature may convince us, that almost every thing is regulated by principles and maxims very different from ours; besides this, I say, it must evidently appear contrary to all rules of analogy to reason, from the intentions and projects of men, to those of a Being so different, and so much superior. In human nature, there is a certain experienced coherence of designs and inclinations; so that when, from any fact, we have discovered one intention of any man, it may often be reasonable, from experience, to infer another, and draw a long chain of conclusions concerning his past or future conduct. But this method of reasoning can never have place with regard to a Being, so remote and incomprehensible, who bears much less analogy to any other being in the universe than the sun to a waxen taper, and who discovers himself only by some faint traces or outlines, beyond which we have no authority to ascribe to him any attribute or perfection. What we imagine to be a superior perfection may really be a defect. Or were it ever so much a perfection, the ascribing of it to the Supreme Being, where it appears not to have been really exerted, to the full, in his works, savours more of flattery and panegyric, than of just reasoning and sound philosophy. All the philosophy, therefore, in the world, and all the religion, which is nothing but a species of philosophy, will never be able to carry us beyond the usual course of experience, or give us measures of conduct and behaviour different from those which are furnished by reflections on common life. No new fact can

[31] In general, it may, I think, be established as a maxim, that where any cause is known only by its *SBN 145* particular effects, it must be impossible to infer any new effects from that cause; since the qualities, which are requisite to produce these new effects along with the former, must either be different, or superior, or of more extensive operation, than those which simply produced the effect, whence alone the cause is supposed to be known to us. We can never, therefore, have any reason to suppose the existence of these qualities. To say, that the new effects proceed only from a continuation of the same energy, which is already known from the first effects, will not remove the difficulty. For even granting this to be the case, (which can seldom be supposed) the very continuation and exertion of a like energy, (for it is impossible it can be absolutely the same) I say, this exertion of a like energy, in a different period of space and time, is a very arbitrary supposition, and what there cannot possibly be any traces of in the effects, from which all our knowledge of the cause is originally derived. Let the *inferred* cause be exactly proportioned (as it should be) to the known effect; and it is impossible that it can possess any qualities, from which new or different effects can be *inferred*.

ever be inferred from the religious hypothesis; no event foreseen or foretold; no reward or punishment expected or dreaded, beyond what is already known by practice and observation. So that my apology for EPICURUS will still appear solid and satisfactory; nor have the political interests of society *SBN 147* any connexion with the philosophical disputes concerning metaphysics and religion.

28 There is still one circumstance, replied I, which you seem to have overlooked. Though I should allow your premises, I must deny your conclusion. You conclude, that religious doctrines and reasonings *can* have no influence on life, because they *ought* to have no influence; never considering, that men reason not in the same manner you do, but draw many consequences from the belief of a divine Existence, and suppose that the Deity will inflict punishments on vice, and bestow rewards on virtue, beyond what appear in the ordinary course of nature. Whether this reasoning of theirs be just or not, is no matter. Its influence on their life and conduct must still be the same. And those, who attempt to disabuse them of such prejudices, may, for aught I know, be good reasoners, but I cannot allow them to be good citizens and politicians; since they free men from one restraint upon their passions, and make the infringement of the laws of society, in one respect, more easy and secure.

29 After all, I may, perhaps, agree to your general conclusion in favour of liberty, though upon different premises from those, on which you endeavour to found it. I think, that the state ought to tolerate every principle of philosophy; nor is there an instance, that any government has suffered in its political interests by such indulgence. There is no enthusiasm among philosophers; their doctrines are not very alluring to the people; and no restraint can be put upon their reasonings, but what must be of dangerous consequence to the sciences, and even to the state, by paving the way for persecution and oppression in points, where the generality of mankind are more deeply interested and concerned.

30 But there occurs to me (continued I) with regard to your main topic, a difficulty, which I shall just propose to you, without insisting on it; lest it lead into reasonings of too nice and delicate a nature. In a word, I much doubt whether it be possible for a cause to be known only by its effect (as you have all along supposed) or to be of so singular and particular a nature as to have no parallel and no similarity with any other cause or object, that has ever fallen under our observation. It is only when two *species* of objects are found to be constantly conjoined, that we can infer the one from the other; and were an effect presented, which was entirely singular, and could not be comprehended under any known *species*, I do not see, that we could form any conjec- *SBN 148*

ture or inference at all concerning its cause. If experience and observation and analogy be, indeed, the only guides which we can reasonably follow in inferences of this nature; both the effect and cause must bear a similarity and resemblance to other effects and causes, which we know, and which we have found, in many instances, to be conjoined with each other. I leave it to your own reflection to pursue the consequences of this principle. I shall just observe, that, as the antagonists of EPICURUS always suppose the universe, an effect quite singular and unparalleled, to be the proof of a Deity, a cause no less singular and unparalleled; your reasonings, upon that supposition, seem, at least, to merit our attention. There is, I own, some difficulty, how we can ever return from the cause to the effect, and, reasoning from our ideas of the former, infer any alteration on the latter, or any addition to it.

SECTION 12

SBN 149

Of the Academical or Sceptical Philosophy

PART 1

1 THERE is not a greater number of philosophical reasonings, displayed upon any subject, than those, which prove the existence of a Deity, and refute the fallacies of *Atheists*; and yet the most religious philosophers still dispute whether any man can be so blinded as to be a speculative atheist. How shall we reconcile these contradictions? The knights-errant, who wandered about to clear the world of dragons and giants, never entertained the least doubt with regard to the existence of these monsters.

2 The *Sceptic* is another enemy of religion, who naturally provokes the indignation of all divines and graver philosophers; though it is certain, that no man ever met with any such absurd creature, or conversed with a man, who had no opinion or principle concerning any subject, either of action or speculation. This begets a very natural question; What is meant by a sceptic? And how far it is possible to push these philosophical principles of doubt and uncertainty?

3 There is a species of scepticism, *antecedent* to all study and philosophy, which is much inculcated by DES CARTES and others, as a sovereign preservative against error and precipitate judgment. It recommends an universal doubt, not only of all our former opinions and principles, but also of our very faculties; of whose veracity, say they, we must assure ourselves, by a chain SBN 150 of reasoning, deduced from some original principle, which cannot possibly be fallacious or deceitful. But neither is there any such original principle, which has a prerogative above others, that are self-evident and convincing: Or if there were, could we advance a step beyond it, but by the use of those very faculties, of which we are supposed to be already diffident. The CARTESIAN doubt, therefore, were it ever possible to be attained by any human creature (as it plainly is not) would be entirely incurable; and no reasoning could ever bring us to a state of assurance and conviction upon any subject.

4 It must, however, be confessed, that this species of scepticism, when more moderate, may be understood in a very reasonable sense, and is a necessary preparative to the study of philosophy, by preserving a proper impartiality in our judgments, and weaning our mind from all those prejudices, which we

may have imbibed from education or rash opinion. To begin with clear and self-evident principles, to advance by timorous and sure steps, to review frequently our conclusions, and examine accurately all their consequences; though by these means we shall make both a slow and a short progress in our systems; are the only methods, by which we can ever hope to reach truth, and attain a proper stability and certainty in our determinations.

5 There is another species of scepticism, *consequent* to science and enquiry, when men are supposed to have discovered, either the absolute fallaciousness of their mental faculties, or their unfitness to reach any fixed determination in all those curious subjects of speculation, about which they are commonly 10 employed. Even our very senses are brought into dispute, by a certain species of philosophers; and the maxims of common life are subjected to the same doubt as the most profound principles or conclusions of metaphysics and theology. As these paradoxical tenets (if they may be called tenets) are to be *SBN 151* met with in some philosophers, and the refutation of them in several, they naturally excite our curiosity, and make us enquire into the arguments, on which they may be founded.

6 I need not insist upon the more trite topics, employed by the sceptics in all ages, against the evidence of *sense*; such as those which are derived from the imperfection and fallaciousness of our organs, on numberless occasions; the 20 crooked appearance of an oar in water; the various aspects of objects, according to their different distances; the double images which arise from the pressing one eye; with many other appearances of a like nature. These sceptical topics, indeed, are only sufficient to prove, that the senses alone are not implicitly to be depended on; but that we must correct their evidence by reason, and by considerations, derived from the nature of the medium, the distance of the object, and the disposition of the organ, in order to render them, within their sphere, the proper *criteria* of truth and falsehood. There are other more profound arguments against the senses, which admit not of so easy a solution. 30

7 It seems evident, that men are carried, by a natural instinct or prepossession, to repose faith in their senses; and that, without any reasoning, or even almost before the use of reason, we always suppose an external universe, which depends not on our perception, but would exist, though we and every sensible creature were absent or annihilated. Even the animal creation are governed by a like opinion, and preserve this belief of external objects, in all their thoughts, designs, and actions.

8 It seems also evident, that, when men follow this blind and powerful instinct of nature, they always suppose the very images, presented by the senses, to be the external objects, and never entertain any suspicion, that the 40

one are nothing but representations of the other. This very table, which we see white, and which we feel hard, is believed to exist, independent of our *SBN 152* perception, and to be something external to our mind, which perceives it. Our presence bestows not being on it: Our absence does not annihilate it. It preserves its existence uniform and entire, independent of the situation of intelligent beings, who perceive or contemplate it.

9 But this universal and primary opinion of all men is soon destroyed by the slightest philosophy, which teaches us, that nothing can ever be present to the mind but an image or perception, and that the senses are only the inlets, through which these images are conveyed, without being able to produce any immediate intercourse between the mind and the object. The table, which we see, seems to diminish, as we remove farther from it: But the real table, which exists independent of us, suffers no alteration: It was, therefore, nothing but its image, which was present to the mind. These are the obvious dictates of reason; and no man, who reflects, ever doubted, that the existences, which we consider, when we say, *this house* and *that tree*, are nothing but perceptions in the mind, and fleeting copies or representations of other existences, which remain uniform and independent.

10 So far, then, are we necessitated by reasoning to contradict or depart from the primary instincts of nature, and to embrace a new system with regard to the evidence of our senses. But here philosophy finds herself extremely embarrassed, when she would justify this new system, and obviate the cavils and objections of the sceptics. She can no longer plead the infallible and irresistible instinct of nature: For that led us to a quite different system, which is acknowledged fallible and even erroneous. And to justify this pretended philosophical system, by a chain of clear and convincing argument, or even any appearance of argument, exceeds the power of all human capacity.

11 By what argument can it be proved, that the perceptions of the mind must *SBN 153* be caused by external objects, entirely different from them, though resembling them (if that be possible) and could not arise either from the energy of the mind itself, or from the suggestion of some invisible and unknown spirit, or from some other cause still more unknown to us? It is acknowledged, that, in fact, many of these perceptions arise not from any thing external, as in dreams, madness, and other diseases. And nothing can be more inexplicable than the manner, in which body should so operate upon mind as ever to convey an image of itself to a substance, supposed of so different, and even contrary a nature.

12 It is a question of fact, whether the perceptions of the senses be produced by external objects, resembling them: How shall this question be determined? By experience surely; as all other questions of a like nature. But here

experience is, and must be entirely silent. The mind has never any thing present to it but the perceptions, and cannot possibly reach any experience of their connexion with objects. The supposition of such a connexion is, therefore, without any foundation in reasoning.

13 To have recourse to the veracity of the Supreme Being, in order to prove the veracity of our senses, is surely making a very unexpected circuit. If his veracity were at all concerned in this matter, our senses would be entirely infallible; because it is not possible that he can ever deceive. Not to mention, that, if the external world be once called in question, we shall be at a loss to find arguments, by which we may prove the existence of that Being or any of his attributes.

14 This is a topic, therefore, in which the profounder and more philosophical sceptics will always triumph, when they endeavour to introduce an universal doubt into all subjects of human knowledge and enquiry. Do you follow the instincts and propensities of nature, may they say, in assenting to the veracity of sense? But these lead you to believe, that the very perception or sensible image is the external object. Do you disclaim this principle, in order to embrace a more rational opinion, that the perceptions are only representations of something external? You here depart from your natural propensities and more obvious sentiments; and yet are not able to satisfy your reason, which can never find any convincing argument from experience to prove, that the perceptions are connected with any external objects. *SBN 154*

15 There is another sceptical topic of a like nature, derived from the most profound philosophy; which might merit our attention, were it requisite to dive so deep, in order to discover arguments and reasonings, which can so little serve to any serious purpose. It is universally allowed by modern enquirers, that all the sensible qualities of objects, such as hard, soft, hot, cold, white, black, *&c.* are merely secondary, and exist not in the objects themselves, but are perceptions of the mind, without any external archetype or model, which they represent. If this be allowed, with regard to secondary qualities, it must also follow, with regard to the supposed primary qualities of extension and solidity; nor can the latter be any more entitled to that denomination than the former. The idea of extension is entirely acquired from the senses of sight and feeling; and if all the qualities, perceived by the senses, be in the mind, not in the object, the same conclusion must reach the idea of extension, which is wholly dependent on the sensible ideas or the ideas of secondary qualities. Nothing can save us from this conclusion, but the asserting, that the ideas of those primary qualities are attained by *Abstraction*; an opinion, which, if we examine it accurately, we shall find to be unintelligible, and even absurd. An extension, that is neither tangible nor visible, cannot

possibly be conceived: And a tangible or visible extension, which is neither hard nor soft, black nor white, is equally beyond the reach of human conception. Let any man try to conceive a triangle in general, which is neither *Isosceles* nor *Scalenum*, nor has any particular length or proportion of sides; and he will soon perceive the absurdity of all the scholastic notions with regard to abstraction and general ideas.[32] *SBN 155*

16 Thus the first philosophical objection to the evidence of sense or to the opinion of external existence consists in this, that such an opinion, if rested on natural instinct, is contrary to reason, and if referred to reason, is contrary to natural instinct, and at the same time carries no rational evidence with it, to convince an impartial enquirer. The second objection goes farther, and represents this opinion as contrary to reason; at least, if it be a principle of reason, that all sensible qualities are in the mind, not in the object. Bereave matter of all its intelligible qualities, both primary and secondary, you in a manner annihilate it, and leave only a certain unknown, inexplicable *something*, as the cause of our perceptions; a notion so imperfect, that no sceptic will think it worth while to contend against it.

PART 2

17 It may seem a very extravagant attempt of the sceptics to destroy *reason* by argument and ratiocination; yet is this the grand scope of all their enquiries and disputes. They endeavour to find objections, both to our abstract reasonings, and to those which regard matter of fact and existence. *SBN 156*

18 The chief objection against all *abstract* reasonings is derived from the ideas of space and time; ideas, which, in common life and to a careless view, are very clear and intelligible, but when they pass through the scrutiny of the profound sciences (and they are the chief object of these sciences) afford principles, which seem full of absurdity and contradiction. No priestly *dogmas*, invented on purpose to tame and subdue the rebellious reason of mankind, ever shocked common sense more than the doctrine of the infinite divisibility of extension, with its consequences; as they are pompously displayed by

[32] This argument is drawn from Dr. Berkeley; and indeed most of the writings of that very ingenious author form the best lessons of scepticism, which are to be found either among the ancient or modern philosophers, Bayle not excepted. He professes, however, in his title-page (and undoubtedly with great truth) to have composed his book against the sceptics as well as against the atheists and free-thinkers. But that all his arguments, though otherwise intended, are, in reality, merely sceptical, appears from this, *that they admit of no answer and produce no conviction*. Their only effect is to cause that momentary amazement and irresolution and confusion, which is the result of scepticism. *SBN 155*

all geometricians and metaphysicians, with a kind of triumph and exultation. A real quantity, infinitely less than any finite quantity, containing quantities infinitely less than itself, and so on, *in infinitum*; this is an edifice so bold and prodigious, that it is too weighty for any pretended demonstration to support, because it shocks the clearest and most natural principles of human reason.[33] But what renders the matter more extraordinary, is, that these seemingly absurd opinions are supported by a chain of reasoning, the clearest and most natural; nor is it possible for us to allow the premises without admitting the consequences. Nothing can be more convincing and satisfactory than all the conclusions concerning the properties of circles and triangles; and yet, when these are once received, how can we deny, that the angle of contact between a circle and its tangent is infinitely less than any rectilineal angle, that as you may encrease the diameter of the circle *in infinitum*, this angle of contact becomes still less, even *in infinitum*, and that the angle of contact between other curves and their tangents may be infinitely less than those between any circle and its tangent, and so on, *in infinitum*? The demonstration of these principles seems as unexceptionable as that which proves the three angles of a triangle to be equal to two right ones, though the latter opinion be natural and easy, and the former big with contradiction and absurdity. Reason here seems to be thrown into a kind of amazement and suspence, which, without the suggestions of any sceptic, gives her a diffidence of herself, and of the ground on which she treads. She sees a full light, which illuminates certain places; but that light borders upon the most profound darkness. And between these she is so dazzled and confounded, that she scarcely can pronounce with certainty and assurance concerning any one object. *SBN 157*

19 The absurdity of these bold determinations of the abstract sciences seems to become, if possible, still more palpable with regard to time than extension. An infinite number of real parts of time, passing in succession, and exhausted one after another, appears so evident a contradiction, that no man, one should think, whose judgment is not corrupted, instead of being improved, by the sciences, would ever be able to admit of it.

20 Yet still reason must remain restless and unquiet, even with regard to that scepticism, to which she is driven by these seeming absurdities and

[33] Whatever disputes there may be about mathematical points, we must allow that there are physical points; that is, parts of extension, which cannot be divided or lessened, either by the eye or imagination. These images, then, which are present to the fancy or senses, are absolutely indivisible, and consequently must be allowed by mathematicians to be infinitely less than any real part of extension; and yet nothing appears more certain to reason, than that an infinite number of them composes an infinite extension. How much more an infinite number of those infinitely small parts of extension, which are still supposed infinitely divisible. *SBN 156*

contradictions. How any clear, distinct idea can contain circumstances, contradictory to itself, or to any other clear, distinct idea, is absolutely incomprehensible; and is, perhaps, as absurd as any proposition, which can be formed. *SBN 158*
So that nothing can be more sceptical, or more full of doubt and hesitation, than this scepticism itself, which arises from some of the paradoxical conclusions of geometry or the science of quantity.[34]

21 The sceptical objections to *moral* evidence, or to the reasonings concerning matter of fact, are either *popular* or *philosophical*. The popular objections are derived from the natural weakness of human understanding; the contradictory opinions, which have been entertained in different ages and nations; 10
the variations of our judgment in sickness and health, youth and old age, prosperity and adversity; the perpetual contradiction of each particular man's opinions and sentiments; with many other topics of that kind. It is needless to insist farther on this head. These objections are but weak. For as, in common life, we reason every moment concerning fact and existence, and cannot possibly subsist, without continually employing this species of argument, any popular objections, derived from thence, must be insufficient to destroy that evidence. The great subverter of PYRRHONISM or the excessive principles of scepticism, is action, and employment, and the occupations of *SBN 159*
common life. These principles may flourish and triumph in the schools; 20
where it is, indeed, difficult, if not impossible, to refute them. But as soon as they leave the shade, and by the presence of the real objects, which actuate our passions and sentiments, are put in opposition to the more powerful principles of our nature, they vanish like smoke, and leave the most determined sceptic in the same condition as other mortals.

22 The sceptic, therefore, had better keep within his proper sphere, and display those *philosophical* objections, which arise from more profound researches. Here he seems to have ample matter of triumph; while he justly

[34] It seems to me not impossible to avoid these absurdities and contradictions, if it be admitted, *SBN 158*
that there is no such thing as abstract or general ideas, properly speaking; but that all general ideas are, in reality, particular ones, attached to a general term, which recalls, upon occasion, other particular ones, that resemble, in certain circumstances, the idea, present to the mind. Thus when the term *horse*, is pronounced, we immediately figure to ourselves the idea of a black or a white animal, of a particular size or figure: But as that term is also usually applied to animals of other colours, figures, and sizes, these ideas, though not actually present to the imagination, are easily recalled; and our reasoning and conclusion proceed in the same way, as if they were actually present. If this be admitted (as seems reasonable) it follows that all the ideas of quantity, upon which mathematicians reason, are nothing but particular, and such as are suggested by the senses and imagination, and consequently, cannot be infinitely divisible. It is sufficient to have dropped this hint at present, without prosecuting it any farther. It certainly concerns all lovers of science not to expose themselves to the ridicule and contempt of the ignorant by their conclusions; and this seems the readiest solution of these difficulties.

insists, that all our evidence for any matter of fact, which lies beyond the testimony of sense or memory, is derived entirely from the relation of cause and effect; that we have no other idea of this relation than that of two objects, which have been frequently *conjoined* together; that we have no argument to convince us, that objects, which have, in our experience, been frequently conjoined, will likewise, in other instances, be conjoined in the same manner; and that nothing leads us to this inference but custom or a certain instinct of our nature; which it is indeed difficult to resist, but which, like other instincts, may be fallacious and deceitful. While the sceptic insists upon these topics, he shows his force, or rather, indeed, his own and our weakness; and seems, for the time at least, to destroy all assurance and conviction. These arguments might be displayed at greater length, if any durable good or benefit to society could ever be expected to result from them.

23 For here is the chief and most confounding objection to *excessive* scepticism, that no durable good can ever result from it; while it remains in its full force and vigour. We need only ask such a sceptic, *What his meaning is? And what he proposes by all these curious researches?* He is immediately at a loss, and *SBN 160* knows not what to answer. A Copernican or Ptolemaic, who supports each his different system of astronomy, may hope to produce a conviction, which will remain constant and durable, with his audience. A Stoic or Epicurean displays principles, which may not only be durable, but which have an effect on conduct and behaviour. But a Pyrrhonian cannot expect, that his philosophy will have any constant influence on the mind: Or if it had, that its influence would be beneficial to society. On the contrary, he must acknowledge, if he will acknowledge any thing, that all human life must perish, were his principles universally and steadily to prevail. All discourse, all action would immediately cease; and men remain in a total lethargy, till the necessities of nature, unsatisfied, put an end to their miserable existence. It is true; so fatal an event is very little to be dreaded. Nature is always too strong for principle. And though a Pyrrhonian may throw himself or others into a momentary amazement and confusion by his profound reasonings; the first and most trivial event in life will put to flight all his doubts and scruples, and leave him the same, in every point of action and speculation, with the philosophers of every other sect, or with those who never concerned themselves in any philosophical researches. When he awakes from his dream, he will be the first to join in the laugh against himself, and to confess, that all his objections are mere amusement, and can have no other tendency than to show the whimsical condition of mankind, who must act and reason and believe; though they are not able, by their most diligent enquiry, to satisfy themselves concerning

the foundation of these operations, or to remove the objections, which may be raised against them.

PART 3

SBN 161

There is, indeed, a more *mitigated* scepticism, or ACADEMICAL philosophy, which may be both durable and useful, and which may, in part, be the result of this PYRRHONISM, or *excessive* scepticism, when its undistinguished doubts are, in some measure, corrected by common sense and reflection. The greater part of mankind are naturally apt to be affirmative and dogmatical in their opinions; and while they see objects only on one side, and have no idea of any counterpoising argument, they throw themselves precipitately into the principles, to which they are inclined; nor have they any indulgence for those who entertain opposite sentiments. To hesitate or balance perplexes their understanding, checks their passion, and suspends their action. They are, therefore, impatient till they escape from a state, which to them is so uneasy; and they think, that they can never remove themselves far enough from it, by the violence of their affirmations and obstinacy of their belief. But could such dogmatical reasoners become sensible of the strange infirmities of human understanding, even in its most perfect state, and when most accurate and cautious in its determinations; such a reflection would naturally inspire them with more modesty and reserve, and diminish their fond opinion of themselves, and their prejudice against antagonists. The illiterate may reflect on the disposition of the learned, who, amidst all the advantages of study and reflection, are commonly still diffident in their determinations: And if any of the learned be inclined, from their natural temper, to haughtiness and obstinacy, a small tincture of PYRRHONISM might abate their pride, by showing them, that the few advantages, which they may have attained over their fellows, are but inconsiderable, if compared with the universal perplexity and confusion, which is inherent in human nature. In general, there is a degree of doubt, and caution, and modesty, which, in all kinds of scrutiny and decision, ought for ever to accompany a just reasoner.

SBN 162

Another species of *mitigated* scepticism, which may be of advantage to mankind, and which may be the natural result of the PYRRHONIAN doubts and scruples, is the limitation of our enquiries to such subjects as are best adapted to the narrow capacity of human understanding. The *imagination* of man is naturally sublime, delighted with whatever is remote and extraordinary, and running, without controul, into the most distant parts of space and time, in order to avoid the objects, which custom has rendered too familiar to it. A

correct *Judgment* observes a contrary method, and avoiding all distant and high enquiries, confines itself to common life, and to such subjects as fall under daily practice and experience; leaving the more sublime topics to the embellishment of poets and orators, or to the arts of priests and politicians. To bring us to so salutary a determination, nothing can be more serviceable, than to be once thoroughly convinced of the force of the PYRRHONIAN doubt, and of the impossibility, that any thing, but the strong power of natural instinct, could free us from it. Those who have a propensity to philosophy, will still continue their researches; because they reflect, that, besides the immediate pleasure, attending such an occupation, philosophical decisions are nothing but the reflections of common life, methodized and corrected. But they will never be tempted to go beyond common life, so long as they consider the imperfection of those faculties which they employ, their narrow reach, and their inaccurate operations. While we cannot give a satisfactory reason, why we believe, after a thousand experiments, that a stone will fall, or fire burn; can we ever satisfy ourselves concerning any determination, which we may form, with regard to the origin of worlds, and the situation of nature, from, and to eternity?

26 This narrow limitation, indeed, of our enquiries, is, in every respect, so reasonable, that it suffices to make the slightest examination into the natural powers of the human mind, and to compare them with their objects, in order to recommend it to us. We shall then find what are the proper subjects of science and enquiry. *SBN 163*

27 It seems to me, that the only objects of the abstract sciences or of demonstration are quantity and number, and that all attempts to extend this more perfect species of knowledge beyond these bounds are mere sophistry and illusion. As the component parts of quantity and number are entirely similar, their relations become intricate and involved; and nothing can be more curious, as well as useful, than to trace, by a variety of mediums, their equality or inequality, through their different appearances. But as all other ideas are clearly distinct and different from each other, we can never advance farther, by our utmost scrutiny, than to observe this diversity, and, by an obvious reflection, pronounce one thing not to be another. Or if there be any difficulty in these decisions, it proceeds entirely from the undeterminate meaning of words, which is corrected by juster definitions. That *the square of the hypothenuse is equal to the squares of the other two sides*, cannot be known, let the terms be ever so exactly defined, without a train of reasoning and enquiry. But to convince us of this proposition, *that where there is no property, there can be no injustice*, it is only necessary to define the terms, and explain injustice to be a violation of property. This proposition is, indeed, nothing but a more

imperfect definition. It is the same case with all those pretended syllogistical reasonings, which may be found in every other branch of learning, except the sciences of quantity and number; and these may safely, I think, be pronounced the only proper objects of knowledge and demonstration.

28 All other enquiries of men regard only matter of fact and existence; and *SBN 164*
these are evidently incapable of demonstration. Whatever *is* may *not be*. No negation of a fact can involve a contradiction. The non-existence of any being, without exception, is as clear and distinct an idea as its existence. The proposition, which affirms it not to be, however false, is no less conceivable and intelligible, than that which affirms it to be. The case is different with the sciences, properly so called. Every proposition, which is not true, is there confused and unintelligible. That the cube root of 64 is equal to the half of 10, is a false proposition, and can never be distinctly conceived. But that CÆSAR, or the angel GABRIEL, or any being never existed, may be a false proposition, but still is perfectly conceivable, and implies no contradiction.

29 The existence, therefore, of any being can only be proved by arguments from its cause or its effect; and these arguments are founded entirely on experience. If we reason *a priori*, any thing may appear able to produce any thing. The falling of a pebble may, for aught we know, extinguish the sun; or the wish of a man controul the planets in their orbits. It is only experience, which teaches us the nature and bounds of cause and effect, and enables us to infer the existence of one object from that of another.[35] Such is the foundation of moral reasoning, which forms the greater part of human knowledge, and is the source of all human action and behaviour.

30 Moral reasonings are either concerning particular or general facts. All deliberations in life regard the former; as also all disquisitions in history, chronology, geography, and astronomy.

31 The sciences, which treat of general facts, are politics, natural philosophy, *SBN 165*
physic, chymistry, *&c.* where the qualities, causes, and effects of a whole species of objects are enquired into.

32 Divinity or Theology, as it proves the existence of a Deity, and the immortality of souls, is composed partly of reasonings concerning particular, partly concerning general facts. It has a foundation in *reason*, so far as it is supported by experience. But its best and most solid foundation is *faith* and divine revelation.

33 Morals and criticism are not so properly objects of the understanding as of

[35] That impious maxim of the ancient philosophy, *Ex nihilo*, *nihil fit*, by which the creation of *SBN 164*
matter was excluded, ceases to be a maxim, according to this philosophy. Not only the will of the Supreme Being may create matter; but, for aught we know *a priori*, the will of any other being might create it, or any other cause, that the most whimsical imagination can assign.

taste and sentiment. Beauty, whether moral or natural, is felt, more properly than perceived. Or if we reason concerning it, and endeavour to fix its standard, we regard a new fact, to wit, the general taste of mankind, or some such fact, which may be the object of reasoning and enquiry.

34 When we run over libraries, persuaded of these principles, what havoc must we make? If we take in our hand any volume; of divinity or school metaphysics, for instance; let us ask, *Does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number?* No. *Does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matter of fact and existence?* No. Commit it then to the flames: For it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion.

EDITOR'S ANNOTATIONS

Plan of the Annotations

The objective of the annotations is to provide information about the text rather than to interpret it. Each annotation serves one or more of seven purposes:

1. *Definition*. A few terms and phrases are defined or explained; however, most archaic, obsolete, or puzzling terms are treated in the Glossary.

2. *Translation*. French, Latin, and Greek quotations supplied by Hume are always translated.

3. *Interpretation*. Interpretation of the text is avoided, but interpretation of the works of authors cited by Hume has not always been avoidable. See 5 below.

4. *Completion of a self-reference*. A few annotations identify a passage to which Hume is referring in his own text (a cross-reference), but without an explicit section reference.

5. *Information on passages in named authors*. Hume's footnote references are expanded in detail, occasionally with brief summaries of cited passages. A few annotations explain, summarize, or paraphrase the context or content of a work that Hume identifies or to which he alludes. These annotations are provided when Hume's surrounding sentences assume more than many readers could be expected to know.

6. *Identification of passages in unnamed authors*. Several annotations identify or suggest unnamed authors to whom Hume alludes. Names and titles of works are supplied, but full names and titles are usually found only in the Biographical Appendix, the Reference List, and the Catalogue.

7. *Identification of the Intellectual Background*. Some annotations make suggestions about Hume's possible sources or assumptions, especially if a passage intimates an author known to have been read by Hume. In some cases the intellectual background of a passage is discussed. These identifications should be considered probable rather than certain or definitive. The discussion is often a selective orientation. To provide context, works are occasionally mentioned that were published after *EHU*.

Forms of Reference

All published materials mentioned in the Annotations are listed in the Reference List. Short-titles are often used. Full bibliographical information is occasionally found only in the Catalogue (Cat.). Page numbers are given only when needed for clarity or specificity; otherwise, divisions in the work (books, parts, chapters, sections, epistles, and the like) are provided.

Standards in the field of classics are used for classical works. Titles in general

scholarly use are preferred, whether English or Latin: for example, Tacitus, *Histories* (not *Historiae*), but Cicero, *De natura deorum* (not *On the Nature of the Gods*). Where both English and Latin titles are in general use, English is preferred. In the case of references, parts or chapters are omitted when irrelevant or misleading. For example, for Hobbes, *Leviathan* (and other works), only chapter and paragraph numbers (not parts) are cited. References to works by Hume (other than his *History of England*) use paragraph numbers rather than page numbers to specific editions. '*Letters*' refers exclusively to the two-volume Greig edition of Hume's letters.

Numbers to the left of each entry (the text material in the lemma) and cross references to annotations are to *page and line* numbers in the text. By contrast, references to the text itself are to *section and paragraph* numbers.

The superscription '[B]' after a person's name indicates that a short biographical description of the person is found in the Biographical Appendix.

Sources of Translated Materials

All Greek and Latin words or passages presented by Hume are translated by M. A. Stewart. All French words or passages presented by Hume are translated by Tom L. Beauchamp. Translations of non-English texts quoted by the editor (and not quoted by Hume) are generally from the published translations listed in the Reference List.

THE ADVERTISEMENT

Advertisement] Hume wrote this Advertisement (that is, public notification or announcement) no later than 26 Oct. 1775, the date on which he sent it to his printer, William Strahan (1715–85): 'Please to enquire at the Warehouse, if any considerable Number of that Edition remain on hands; and if there do, I beg the favour of you, that you woud throw off an equal Number of this Advertisement, and give out no more Copies without prefixing it to the second volume' (*Letters*, 2: 301). Two weeks after Hume delivered this Advertisement, he reminded Strahan that the quarto edition of 1768 would need it (*Letters*, 2: 304). Strahan's ledgers indicate that the Advertisement was printed in Jan. 1776, in three formats, corresponding to the different page sizes of the 1768, 1770, and 1772 editions, for which he printed 250, 500, and 500 copies, respectively. (Strahan Ledgers, 48801, 1776 Jan. [68]. London. British Library, Department of Manuscripts. See also *Letters*, 2: 301, 304.) Strahan later lost some stock in a warehouse fire in Mar. 1776 (*Letters*, 2: 313). The only surviving copies of the original inserts thus far discovered are in two copies of volume 1 of the 1770 *ETSS*, though Hume had requested that it be placed in volume 2 (which, in the four-volume 1770 edition, would have been volume 3). (Liverpool University Library Copy, vol. 1, Fraser 832; and A. Wayne Colver, personal copy, as reported in Colver, 'A Variant of Hume's Advertisement Repudiating the *Treatise*'.) See the Introduction to this volume (pp. xiv–xvi) for other aspects of the history and substance of this Advertisement.

several writers] In his letter of 26 Oct. 1775 Hume expressed an apparent motive for writing this Advertisement: 'It is a compleat Answer to Dr Reid and to that bigotted silly Fellow, Beattie' (*Letters*, 2: 301). Hume's mention of Scottish philosophers Thomas Reid (1710–96) and James Beattie (1735–1803) refers to criticisms directed at *THN* by those two authors. For an extended discussion of possible reasons for this mention of Reid and Beattie, see James Somerville, *The Enigmatic Parting Shot: What was Hume's 'Compleat Answer to Dr Reid and to That Bigotted Silly Fellow, Beattie'?*

contained in this volume . . . never acknowledged] In saying he 'never acknowledged' his *Treatise*, Hume alludes to the fact that he published the book anonymously (though there are letters in which he acknowledges that the *Treatise* is his). 'Contained in this volume' and 'the following pieces' are references to the writings in *ETSS*—primarily *EHU*, *DIS*, and *EPM*, but possibly including *NHR* and Hume's moral, political, and literary essays.

AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING

SECTION 1

5.1 **Moral philosophy]** *Moral* philosophy is the study of *human* nature (including the inner life of the mind and human behaviour), whereas *natural* philosophy is the study of *physical* nature. Perception, conception, reasoning, taste, and judgement are within the scope of moral philosophy. 'Moral philosophy', 'moral reasoning', and the 'moral sciences' were used to refer to the full range of topics concerned with the mind and spirit, as well as conduct and character. Cf. *THN*, Introduction 10.

5.1 **science of human nature]** See Hume's stated objective in *THN* (Introduction 6–7; cf. *Abstract* 1–3) of developing a science of human nature, including an attempt to ground all other sciences in a theory of human nature. Some of Hume's predecessors had proposed that moral philosophy could employ the experimental method used in natural philosophy to account for the moral phenomena of the mind. See George Turnbull (1698–1749; regent at Marischal College, Aberdeen), *Principles*, title page, epistle dedicatory, preface, and introduction to pt. 1 (a post-*THN* work); and English poet Alexander Pope (1688–1744), *Essay on Man*, epistle 1. In *Opticks* 3.1 Isaac Newton[B] himself made the suggestion that his method could be applied to moral philosophy.

5.1 **two different manners]** See the final lines of *THN* (3.3.6.6) and the annotations below, especially ann. 8.15.

5.5 **taste]** 'Taste' is a properly cultivated faculty of mind that enables a person to reach good judgements about what is appropriate, excellent, beautiful, and the like. Hume writes extensively about taste in 'Of the Standard of Taste' and *EPM* 1.3–4, 1.10, 7.4, 7.28, Appx. 3.10. Much was written in the 18th century about taste. Joseph

Addison,[B] citing authors mentioned by Hume, defines 'Taste in Writing' as 'that Faculty . . . which discerns the Beauties of an Author with Pleasure, and the Imperfections with Dislike' (*Spectator* 409; cf. 412–18). Irish statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke (1729–97)—writing in a manner reminiscent of Hume, but a few years after Hume published *EHU*—defined taste as follows: 'I mean by the word Taste no more than that faculty, or those faculties of the mind which are affected with, or which form a judgement of the works of imagination and the elegant arts' (*Philosophical Enquiry*, introduction, 13). See also two wide-ranging essays in the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and D'Alembert, 7: 761–7: 'Goût', by François Marie Arouet de Voltaire,[B] and an incomplete article, 'Essai sur le goût', by French lawyer and political philosopher Baron de Montesquieu (1689–1755).

5.5 **sentiment]** 'Sentiment' is an inner sensing, feeling, or emotion—for example, anger, approval, disgust, sympathy, or compassion. The term was a key concept in moral and aesthetic treatises of Hume's period. English encyclopaedist Ephraim Chambers (d. 1740) defines taste as 'a general Name for all the ideas consequent on the operations of the mind, and even for the operations themselves' (*Cyclopœdia*, 'thought'). 'Sentiment', like 'taste', was sometimes used to refer to judgement and opinion.

5.9 **eloquence]** Principles of eloquence were closely studied during Hume's period. In 'Of Eloquence' and elsewhere Hume mentions the achievements of Demosthenes[B] and Cicero[B] and the writings of Quintilian (1st c. AD) and 'Longinus' (a work of unknown authorship). For allusions to Demosthenes and 'Longinus', see *EPM* 5.11; 7.4, 12; 8.7; Appx. 4.5. 'Longinus' was considered by many the premier figure in rhetoric, the field that studies eloquence (a 1733 edition was in the Hume Library). Works on rhetoric by Cicero, Quintilian, and Aristotle[B] were basic reading in this field during the years in which Hume wrote *EHU*. A philosophy course in rhetoric at the University of Edinburgh surveyed precisely these writings (Henderson, 'Short Account', 373). Adam Smith (1723–90) also began to lecture on rhetoric in 1748. For references to influential conceptions in the 18th century, see Chambers, *Cyclopœdia*, 'eloquence' (designating Demosthenes and Cicero as the 'princes of ancient eloquence'); Aberdeen professor of divinity George Campbell (1719–96), *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (especially 1.1–4) and *Lectures . . . on Pulpit Eloquence*; and Scottish clergyman and rhetorician Hugh Blair (1718–1800), *Lectures on Rhetoric* 25–34, the latter citing classical sources that formed the cornerstone of discussions in the 18th century. A negative appraisal of the power of eloquence is found in English hymnwriter and philosopher Isaac Watts (1674–1748), *Logick: or, The Right Use of Reason* 2.3.2.

5.10 **easy and obvious]** This first species has as its objective influencing action by taste and sentiment. Cicero,[B] La Bruyère,[B] and Addison[B]—mentioned by Hume immediately below—are probably to be classified in this group. In *THN* Hume characterized his philosophy as 'abstruse' and not 'easy and obvious' (Introduction 3, 1.3.12.20, 1.4.2.46, 3.1.1.1); see also *EHU* 1.3, 16.

5.19 **other species of philosophers**] Probable members of this 'species' are Aristotle,[B] Nicolas Malebranche,[B] and John Locke,[B] as mentioned by Hume immediately below. Several philosophers had proposed the objective of a scientific philosophy; Hume was familiar, for example, with Malebranche's view that 'Of all human sciences, the science of man is the most worthy' (*Search after Truth*, preface, p. xxv; see also 4.6.2). However, Hume suggests a wider conception of accurate and abstruse philosophy than the early modern conception of a science of man.

5.21 **subject of speculation**] Some of Hume's comments, in this first section of *EHU*, on the 'delineation of the distinct parts and powers of the mind' (and his concentration throughout on the understanding) are reminiscent of passages in Locke.[B] English philosopher Lord Shaftesbury (1671–1713), Locke's student, wrote that 'How little regard soever may be shown to that moral speculation or inquiry which we call the study of ourselves, it must, in strictness, be yielded that all knowledge whatsoever depends upon this previous one' (*Characteristics*, 'Miscellaneous Reflections' 4.1 (274)).

5.26 **criticism**] literary and related forms of criticism of the arts; also the art of judging discourse and writing (see also 1.15).

6.31 **Cicero**[B]] In 'Of the Standard of Taste' 26, Hume comments that 'The abstract philosophy of Cicero has lost its credit: The vehemence of his oratory is still the object of our admiration'. See also 'Of Eloquence' 3, 14, 16–17; and 'Of Tragedy' 8.

6.31 **Aristotle**[B]] Aristotle's influence waned under the force of criticisms levelled since the Renaissance, and serious proponents of Aristotelianism were few in number by the time Hume wrote *EHU*. Reasons explaining this decay that are congenial to Hume's views had been offered by Francis Bacon,[B] *Novum organum* 46–7; French priest and philosopher Pierre Gassendi (1592–1655), *Exercises Against the Aristotelians*, which contains a useful summary in its preface; and English philosopher and clergyman Joseph Glanvill (1636–80), *Scepsis scientifica* 18–22. For an indignant dismissal of Aristotle, see English preacher John Webster (1610–82), *Academiarum examen* 6–7. Locke[B] may have initiated some of the prevailing opposition to Aristotelian logic.

6.31 **La Bruyere**[B]] Jean de La Bruyère was a French prose stylist, satirist, and moralist who used bold metaphors and similes in his epigrammatic maxims, short stories, character sketches, and short moral essays. Hume praised La Bruyère as a 'fine Writer' and refers to his 'De l'homme' in *Les caractères* in correspondence of 10 Jan. 1743 (*Letters*, 1: 46) with Irish philosopher Francis Hutcheson (1694–1746).

6.33 **Malebranche**[B]] Nicolas Malebranche was trained in Aristotelianism and became immersed in Cartesian philosophy and its reconciliation to Church doctrine. Although some readers commend him for an elegant and careful style, other readers find his writing inelegant and meticulous.

6.34 **Addison**[B]] Hume is evidently referring to the periodical essays of Addison, which were widely read at the time. Some commentators maintain that his style elevated the essay to new levels of excellence in organization, simplicity, and precision. Hume begins 'Of Simplicity and Refinement in Writing' by quoting Addison on 'fine writing'. At *EPM* 6.8 Hume refers to an 'elegant writer'—a clear allusion to Addison (see Box, 'An Allusion'; cf. *DIS* 2.9).

6.34 **Locke**[B]] Locke wrote his major philosophical works in an abstract and studied, although generally clear and precise, style. In editions of *EHU* prior to 1756 Hume appended a note specifying that his comment 'is not intended any way to detract from the Merit of Mr. *Locke*, who was really a great Philosopher, and a just and modest Reasoner. 'Tis only meant to shew the common Fate of such abstract Philosophy' (*Philosophical Essays*, 1748 edn., p. 5 n.).

7.2 **the sciences]** According to *THN* Introduction 4–5, these sciences included mathematics, natural philosophy, natural religion, logic, morals, criticism, and politics.

7.6 **polite letters]** literature exhibiting refined taste and quality of style. In his *History of England* (vol. 6, ch. 71) Hume lists poetry, eloquence, and history as among the 'branches of polite letters'. Polite authors often reinforced the standards of cultured society in matters of taste, manners, morals, and religion. Such authors include Addison,[B] Pope, Henry Fielding, and Richard Steele. See also Hume's essays 'Of the Delicacy of Taste and Passion' and 'Of Simplicity and Refinement in Writing'.

7.16 **bounds of human understanding]** For additional comments on these bounds, see *Abstract* 27; *THN* 1.2.1.2; *Dialogues* 1.3; *EHU* 1.2; 7.24, 28; 8.22; 12.25 (also ann. 11.1 and 28.4 below). At *EHU* 5.1 Hume indicates that academic scepticism influenced his views on this subject. Modern writers known to Hume who discuss the limits of the understanding include Bacon,[B] *Novum organum* 41–54, 101–4; French essayist and philosopher Michel de Montaigne (1533–92), 'On Experience' and 'That it is Madness to Judge the True and the False from our own Capacities' (*Essays* 13, 27); Locke,[B] *Essay*, Epistle to the Reader, 1.1.4–7, 4.3; Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 3.1.2.1, 5; Scottish mathematician and natural philosopher John Keill (1671–1721), *An Introduction to the True Astronomy*, preface, pp. iv–vi; Antoine Arnauld[B] and Pierre Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, ch. 1; Pierre Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Pyrrho' [B]; and Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica* 6.6.

8.15 **anatomist . . . painter]** Hume presented himself in correspondence with Hutcheson as an 'anatomist' in moral philosophy, not a 'painter' (*Letters*, 1: 32–3). Beginning at *THN* 1.4.6.23, Hume characterized his philosophy as an anatomy of the human mind; and in *Abstract* 2 he repeated that his objective was to 'anatomize human nature in a regular manner', rather than to commend virtue or to develop a broad metaphysical theory. At *THN* 3.3.6.6 Hume uses this distinction to explain his work and its potential practical importance. See also *THN* 2.1.12.2; *Abstract* 2.

9.16 **superstitions]** 'Superstition' commonly refers, in Hume's usage, to extravagant practices and related beliefs. His paradigm in the case of a supernatural religion is Roman Catholicism. By contrast, the characteristic vice of Protestantism is enthusiasm. See ann. 110.25; *NHR* 12.22; and Hume's 'Of Superstition and Enthusiasm'. See also English philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) on the differences between religion and superstition, *Leviathan* 6.36, 11.26; and the condemnation of superstition by English philosopher Anthony Collins (1676–1729), *Discourse of Free-Thinking*, 35 ff.

10.29 **mental geography]** Compare Locke,[B] *Essay* 1.1.1–2, 6.

11.1 **compass of human understanding]** Locke[B] introduces the last chapter in his *Essay* 4.21 ('Of the Division of the Sciences') by speaking of 'All that can fall within the compass of Humane Understanding'.

11.6 **late ones, of success]** In *THN* Introduction 7 (note) and *Abstract* 2 Hume mentions Locke,[B] Shaftesbury, Mandeville, Hutcheson, and Butler as among 'some late philosophers in *England*, who have begun to use experimental reasoning to put the science of man on a new footing'. In the text of *THN* Introduction 7 Hume suggests that Francis Bacon[B] was the father of experimental physics.

11.11 **so intimately concerned]** The first two editions of *EHU* (*Philosophical Essays* of 1748 and 1750) contained at this point an additional note acknowledging the influence of Hutcheson and expressing an indebtedness to the *Sermons* of English philosopher and bishop Joseph Butler (1692–1752). *EHU*, 1748 edn. (pp. 15–16); see the Editorial Appendix below.

11.16 **phænomena]** In natural philosophy this term refers to any appearance, effect, or operation of a natural body. More generally, it means any appearance or effect present to the mind or any observed operation of the mind. The term dates from ancient philosophy and science, especially Greek astronomy. Many modern philosophers and scientists used the term, including Bacon,[B] Hobbes, Gassendi, Descartes,[B] Kepler, Boyle, Glanvill, Keill, and Newton.[B] Hume follows the tradition that associates the term with the experimental method.

11.17 **philosopher . . . arose]** The reference is to Newton,[B] who used the term 'phænomena' in *Mathematical Principles*, bk. 3, to characterize the planetary movements. His fourth rule formulates the methodological principle that immediately observable phenomena must alone constitute the foundation of astronomy. The extent of Hume's familiarity with Newton's writings is unknown, but he likely knew the preface, definitions, axioms, general scholium, and rules of reasoning in *Mathematical Principles*—as well as the preface to the second edition by English mathematician Roger Cotes (1682–1716) and scattered parts of the *Opticks*. The interpretation of Newton found in *EHU* was commonplace in the mid-18th century (see ann. 26.6, 28.24, 29.27, and n. 16).

Hume's tribute to Newton in the *History of England* (ch. 71) is unparalleled in comparison to the praise he extends to other writers he esteems: 'In Newton this

island may boast of having produced the greatest and rarest genius that ever rose for the ornament and instruction of the species. . . . His reputation at last broke out with a lustre, which scarcely any writer, during his own life-time, had ever before attained' (6: 542). See also the praise in Hume's early essay (withdrawn after 1742), 'Of the Middle Station of Life' 8, and ann. n. 16, n. 17, and n. 33.

11.34 **Moralists . . . critics, logicians . . . politicians]** Hume views various writers in moral philosophy—Hobbes, in particular—as having such shortcomings. 'Logicians' are those who teach reasoning and explain the nature of reasoning; see a parallel section in *THN* Introduction 5, where Hume characterizes 'the end of logic' as to 'explain the principles and operations of our reasoning faculty, and the nature of our ideas'. 'Politicians' are those skilled in governing a political state. (On 'criticism', see ann. Section 1.2.)

12.24 **abstruse philosophy]** See ann. 5.10 on Hume's characterization of his philosophy as abstruse. Although he sometimes speaks disparagingly of 'abstruser studies of logic and metaphysics' (see *EPM* 1.4, 5.3, Appx. 1.10), he does not depreciate the importance of abstruse reasoning in difficult areas of philosophy. See 'abstruse philosophy' at *THN* 3.1.1.1.

SECTION 2

SECTION 2] This section shows similarities to *THN* 1.1.1–3.

13.2 **perceptions of the mind]** At *THN* 1.2.6.7 (cf. 1.1.1.1) Hume says that 'nothing is ever really present with the mind but its perceptions or impressions and ideas, and that external objects become known to us only by those perceptions they occasion'. At *THN* 1.1.2.1 he says that impressions of sensation arise 'in the soul originally, from unknown causes', and that the examination of such matters belongs to 'anatomists and natural philosophers' rather than to moral philosophers. Prominent works known to Hume on such problems include Locke,[B] *Essay*, Epistle, 1.1.8, 2.1.23, 2.8.8, 4.1.1; and Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, chs. 1–2. For Berkeley,[B] Malebranche,[B] and other possible sources, see ann. 13.28. See also Gassendi, *Institutio logica* 1, especially canons 2–3; and French philosopher Étienne Bonnot de Condillac (1715–80), *Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge* 1.2.1 (a copy of the 1746 edition is in the Hume Library).

13.4 **sensation . . . imagination . . . force and vivacity]** This theory about phenomenal differences in forcefulness and vivacity may be indebted to Malebranche[B] (himself perhaps indebted to Descartes[B]). Malebranche distinguished three types of sensations: the strong and lively (*sensations fortes et vives*), the weak and languid (*sensations faibles et languissantes*), and those in between (*Search after Truth* 1.12.3–5). He maintained that the senses and the imagination differ in degree, with images tending to be comparatively weak and languid. Berkeley[B] analyses 'ideas of sense' as 'more strong, orderly, and coherent than the creatures of the mind' (*Principles* 1.30, 33). In *THN* (1.1.1.3 ff.) Hume uses the language of force and vivacity as well as

surrogate terms such as *liveliness*, *violence*, *vigour*, *firmness*, *intensity*, *solidity*, *forcible*, and *real*.

13.28 IDEAS . . . IMPRESSIONS] A discussion of this distinction appears in *THN*, beginning at 1.1.1.1. For an 18th-century explication of the terms, see Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'idea', 'impression', 'imagination', and 'sensation'. For accounts that may have influenced Hume, see Greek authority on scepticism Sextus Empiricus (2nd–3rd c. AD), *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.19–22 (chs. 10–11); Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 1.1.1, 3.2.1; Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.1.1–24, 2.8.7–8, 2.29.2–4, 4.1.1–2, 4.21.4; Gassendi, *Institutio logica* 1, especially canons 1–4, 15; Berkeley,[B] *Principles*, 1.1, 4, 8, 30, 33, 39; Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, chs. 1–2, 6 (Buroker, 25–31, 39–40). See also a controversy between Malebranche and Arnauld (especially Arnauld, *On True and False Ideas* 3–6), and reflections by Bayle[B] on these authors in *Nouvelles de la republique des lettres*, Mois d'Avril 1684, art. 2, 'Réponse de l'auteur de la *Recherche de la Verité* au livre de m. Arnaud' (*Œuvres diverses*, 25–7). Locke's theory had numerous critics, though none who proposed precisely Hume's modification.

14.4 **may seem more unbounded]** Compare Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.12.1–2, and other passages in Locke listed immediately below.

14.7 **imagination . . . compounding, transposing, augmenting, or diminishing]** Similar facility and tasks had been assigned to the imagination or a related function of mind by Gassendi, *Institutio logica* 1, canons 3–5; Addison,[B] *Spectator* 411–19; Locke,[B] *Essay* 1.4.20; 2.1.1–5; 2.2.2; 2.7.10; 2.12.1–2, 8; and Hobbes, *Leviathan* 2–3. Hume's conceptions and terminology are reminiscent of Addison's visual images and Locke's language of 'compounded'.

14.20 **golden mountain]** Compare *THN* 1.2.2.8. The example of a golden mountain was common in philosophical discussions of the role of the imagination in compounding ideas. See Hobbes, *Human Nature, or the Fundamental Elements of Policy* 3.4 (*Works*, 4: 11) and *Elements of Philosophy* 25.9 (*Works*, 1: 400); Gassendi, *Institutio logica* 1, canon 3; Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 3.2.1; Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, chs. 1–2 (Buroker, 28, 32); Berkeley,[B] *Three Dialogues*, dial. 2 (224).

14.24 **outward or inward sentiment]** On the point about 'all the materials' and thinking as 'derived' (and the role of experience), see Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.1.1–5, 2.2.2, 2.9.15.

14.30 **simple ideas]** Compare Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.2.1–3, 2.12.1–8, 3.4.7.

15.3 **organ . . . sensation]** Organs of sensation are sensory capacities in the body, such as touch and vision. At *THN* 2.1.5.6 (cf. 2.2.11.16) Hume speaks of 'organs of the human mind' to point to the structure and faculties of the mind. See his mixed physical–psychological uses of 'organ' in *EHU* 1.8, 7.9–12, 7.21, 12.6.

15.5 **blind man . . . deaf man]** Compare *THN* 1.1.1.9. Locke[B] presents a subtle example and set of conclusions in *Essay* 1.4.20; see also 2.2.2, 2.4.5, 2.9.8, 3.4.11.

Related claims are in Gassendi, *Institutio logica* 1, canon 2; Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, ch. 1 (Buroker, 28); Newton,[B] *Mathematical Principles* 3 (Motte–Cajori, 545).

15.10 **Laplander]** Lapland is in Scandinavia above the Arctic Circle, ranging over northern Finland, Sweden, Norway, and the Kola Peninsula of north-west Russia. For a discussion of 'Laplanders' and a possible source, see *NHR* 4.3, where Hume refers to French playwright and comedian Jean-François Regnard (1655–1709), *Journey to Lapland*. Regnard describes Laplanders as naïve and addicted to magic, superstition, and paganism.

15.33 **particular shade of blue]** Compare Hume's similar treatment of this problem in *THN* 1.1.1.10.

16.5 **general maxim]** The axiom or fundamental principle that simple ideas are always derived from correspondent impressions was introduced at *EHU* 2.6.

16.13 **determinate idea]** Compare Locke,[B] *Essay* 3.10.2 and Epistle to the Reader, 12–13.

16.18 **employed without any meaning]** Compare *THN* 1.1.7.14, 1.2.5.21, 1.3.14.14, 1.4.7.5; *EHU* 7.26. For related views by Hume's predecessors, see Bacon,[B] *Novum organum* 59–60; Hobbes, *Leviathan* 4.12–13, 20–1; 5.5, 8–15; 8.27; Locke,[B] *Essay* 3.2.4–8, 3.10.2–4; Berkeley,[B] *Alciphron* 7.1–2; Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, ch. 11 (Buroker, 58–60); and Samuel Clarke,[B] *Discourse*, prop. 6, in *Works*, 2: 659, 663–4.

n. 1 **innate ideas]** In Locke[B] the human mind has inborn *capacities* for knowledge but no inborn *ideas*. For Locke's criticism of defenders of innate ideas, see *Essay* 1.2.1, 5, 8, 14–17, 21–4; 1.3.15–19. See, similarly, *THN* 1.1.1.12; and see 1.3.14.6, 10. However, in his *Abstract* Hume expresses a perceived difference between his views and Locke's: 'he comprehends all our perceptions under the term of idea, in which sense it is false, that we have no innate ideas. For it is evident our stronger perceptions or impressions are innate, and that natural affection, love of virtue, resentment, and all the other passions, arise immediately from nature' (*Abstract* 6).

English philosopher and diplomat Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1583–1648) is the only figure explicitly criticized by Locke (*Essay* 1.3.15 ff.) on innate ideas, although several British philosophers held views relevantly similar to those that Locke criticizes. In *De veritate* (119–21, 132, 139–40, 289 ff.), the work cited by Locke, Lord Herbert argued that the human mind is endowed by nature with certain principles or beliefs called 'common notions' that are immediately apprehended, necessary for experience, irrefutable, and denied only by madmen.

n. 1 **loose sense, by Locke[B] and others]** See Locke, *Essay*, bk. 2. Others whose theories have spawned a variety of interpretations include Descartes[B] (*Meditations* 3, 6; *Objections and Replies* 2, 3, 5); Hobbes (*Elements of Philosophy . . . concerning Body* 25.1 ff., in *Works*, 1: 389 ff.); Berkeley[B] (*Principles* 1.5, 56, 97; *Dialogues* 3; *Theory of*

Vision 53, 78, 99, 135); and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz,[B] *New Essays* 2.1–13 (a work not published until 1765).

n. 1 **schoolmen]** These scholastic theologians and medieval philosophers had been attacked in Locke,[B] *Essay* 3.4.8–10 and 3.10.6–8; see the caustic observations in Hobbes, *Leviathan* 1.5, 2.9, 5.15, 8.27, 12.31, 46.13–30; and Webster, *Academiarum examen* 2–3 (with a response by English clergyman and philosopher John Wilkins (1614–72) and English clergyman and mathematician Seth Ward (1617–89), *Vindiciæ academiarum*). See Hume's comment at *EHU* 8.27 and *EPM* 9.2 on *schools*.

SECTION 3

ASSOCIATION OF IDEAS] In the first two editions Hume's title was 'Of the Connexion of Ideas'. For his earlier view, see *THN* 1.1.4, 'Of the connexion or association of ideas' (and the following three sections of *THN*).

A capacity for connecting ideas—so that the awareness of one type of idea naturally results in attention to another—was a recurrent topic of interest. Chambers provides a representative definition (*Cyclopædia*, 'association', invoking Locke[B]): 'Association *of Ideas*, is where two or more ideas, constantly and immediately follow or succeed one another in the mind, so that one shall almost infallibly produce the other; whether there be any natural relation between them, or not. Where there is a real affinity or connection in ideas, it is the excellency of the mind, to be able to collect, compare, and range them.'

Hume is informed by Locke's discussion (*Essay* 2.33; added in the 4th edn.), which bears a chapter title identical to Hume's. Another likely influence is the account of natural connection in Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 2.1.5.1–2, 2.2.2. Berkeley's discussions of various relationships among ideas also seem to anticipate Hume. Many writers cited Locke, who was the first to write specifically on the topic. Although Locke considers a different range of topics than does Hume, and generally treats association as hindering understanding, he also holds that 'Some of our *Ideas* have a natural Correspondence and Connexion one with another' (2.33.5).

17.1 **principle of connexion]** Locke[B] and Hume would have known the discussion in Hobbes (*Leviathan* 3.1–11), which treats association as a mechanistic function of mind. In addition to Malebranche,[B] Hobbes, Locke, and Berkeley,[B] discussion that either supports or denies the existence of association and principles of connection had appeared in Turnbull (*Principles*, 1: 81–96); English clergyman and philosopher John Gay (1699–1745), *Preliminary Dissertation*, especially pp. xxxi–xxxii; and philosopher and bishop Edmund Law (1703–87), *An Enquiry into the Ideas of Space, Time, Immensity, and Eternity*, 45–6.

In *THN* 1.1.4.1–2 Hume analyses what he here calls principles of connection in terms of 'qualities, from which this association arises'. See also *THN* 1.3.6.13, as well as general discussions of association in *THN* 1.3.3–8, 14; 2.1.4.

17.8 **at adventures]** without design or by chance. The distinction plays a role in Hobbes, who uses the language of 'unguided, without design' in *Leviathan* 3.3. Locke[B] similarly speaks of some connections of ideas as 'owing to Chance' (*Essay* 2.33.5, 7), and characterizes trains of ideas as irrational, loose, and independent. Even under these 'loose and free' conditions, Locke thought that some regular connections exist.

17.23 **class all the principles]** In the final paragraph of his *Abstract* Hume notes that any claim he has to originality in *THN* depends on the use he has made of these principles of association.

18.3 **run over several instances]** Other examples are found in *THN*, following the section on association (1.1.4). In one sequence of examples (1.3.8–9) Hume mentions instances of religious beliefs—such as the way in which religious images enhance Roman Catholic beliefs (an example of resemblance)—that are notably similar to passages and examples at *EHU* 5.14–22.

18.20 **compositions of genius]** In *THN* 1.1.7.15 Hume characterizes the associations of the imagination as a form of 'genius'—that is, 'a kind of magical faculty in the soul' that brings together ideas through the principle of resemblance.

18.25 **ravings of a madman]** possibly an allusion to the account of association in Locke,[B] who discusses the erroneous associations at work in madness (*Essay* 2.33.3–4; cf. 2.11.13).

18.27 **rule admits of no exception]** On the relevant 'rules of art and criticism'—all 'founded on the qualities of human nature'—see *THN* 2.2.8.18. See also the related comments in 'Of the Standard of Taste' 9; *DIS* 4.10.

18.30 **kind of *Unity*]** See 3.10 below on unity of action. Hume at this point begins to reflect on traditional theories of unity of action.

18.35 **Ovid[B]]** *Metamorphoses* recounts legends about transformations from the earliest time to the age of Julius Caesar (1st c. BC). The work attains unity and narrative continuity in its 'fabulous' (i.e. legendary) stories through the overarching idea of metamorphosis—the feature that makes every account *resemble* the previous and the subsequent account.

19.4 **contiguity in time and place]** Compare the discussion of this subject in *THN* 2.3.7 (also 1.4.5.12–14). See also Hutcheson on 'the Associations of Ideas' in *Inquiry into the Original*, treatise 1, 6.3, 11–12.

19.23 ***Unity* of *Action*, about which all critics]** a reference to Aristotelian and neoclassical theories of unity. Hume appeals to these accounts below (see the *Iliad* and other works), together with his three principles of association, to discuss unity in drama, poetry, and history. Unity of time, place, and action have traditionally been distinguished. For an informative general account of the three unities of time, place, and action, see English poet and critic John Dryden (1631–1700), 'An Essay of Dramatick Poesie' (*Prose 1668–1691*, especially 16–19, 36–7, 46–7), which contains pertinent references. See also Samuel Johnson, *Rambler* 156; S. H. Butcher,

Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art 7, 'The Dramatic Unities'; and Heinrich Breitinger, *Les Unités d'Aristote*.

n. 5 **Aristotle**[B]] Footnote reference: Aristotle, *Poetics* 1451[a]15–19. The passage from Aristotle may be translated, 'A plot is not unitary, as some suppose, in virtue of being about one individual. For many, indeed countless, things happen to the individual from which there is no single outcome. Likewise, many are the actions of an individual, out of which no unitary action ensues.' See also *Poetics* 1451[a]20–35. The unity of a plot consists not only in the unity of the individual or the hero, but also in the unity of action.

19.25 **accuracy of philosophy**] presumably a reference to the theory of principles of association.

20.1 **epic poetry**] On 'unity in an epic' and its connection to tragedy, see Aristotle,[B] *Poetics* 1461[b]26–1462[b]15.

20.17 **enliven the imagery, and gratify the fancy**] Some of these themes are explored in Hobbes, *Answer to Sir William Davenant's Preface* (*Works*, 4: 449–53).

20.18 ***Iliad***] The *Iliad* depicts the tragic consequences of the wrath of Achilles mentioned immediately below. Hume evidently believes that this work conforms to his account of principles of association and has sufficient unity of action.

20.20 ***Henriade***] *La Henriade* is an epic poem by Voltaire.[B] The hero is Henri of Navarre, later Henri IV of France. The poem treats the siege of Paris by Henri III and Henri of Navarre, the assassination of Henri III, the defeat of the Ligue, and Henri IV's entry into Paris. Hume quotes the work in 'Of the Liberty of the Press' 3.

20.23 **Hector . . . Helen . . . Paris**] Hector first appears in the *Iliad* leading the Trojans in battle and reappears prominently in later battles (bks. 5–6, 11–17). Helen's circumstances and motives in leaving with Paris for Troy are hazy, but she is depicted as a pawn of the gods. After Paris' death and the end of the war she is reconciled with Menelaus. Hector's death serves as the vengeance of Menelaus for the injury received when Paris escaped with Helen.

21.14 **oblique narration . . . *Odyssey* and *Æneid***] Citation of Homer[B] and Roman poet Virgil (1st c. BC) as models of narration was popular at the time Hume wrote. By 'oblique narration' Hume means telling a story, not through the narrator, but through a character in retrospect. In the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid* the story is framed around the struggles of the central characters—Odysseus and Aeneas—to return home. The action of both works involves central figures in the midst of their journeys.

In *Lectures on Rhetoric* 42 Hugh Blair provides commentary on the 'oblique narration' in both of these works:

> In the narration of the poet . . . it is not material, whether he relate the whole story in his own character, or introduce some of his personages to relate any part of the

> action that had passed before the poem opens. Homer follows the one method in his Iliad, and the other in his Odyssey; Virgil has in this respect imitated the conduct of the Odyssey; Tasso that of the Iliad. The chief advantage which arises from any of the actors being employed to relate part of the story, is, that it allows the poet, if he chooses it, to open with some interesting situation of affairs [commencing in the midst of things], informing us afterwards of what had passed before that period; and gives him the greater liberty of spreading out such parts of the subject as he is inclined to dwell upon in person, and of comprehending the rest within a short recital. Where the subject is of great extent, and comprehends the transactions of several years, as in the Odyssey and the Æneid, this method therefore seems preferable.

Hume and Blair are pairing the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid* for the same structural reason, and they may be thinking back to a common source of commentary. See the elaborate account of the unity of action and themes related to the above in Alexander Pope, 'Preface' to the *Iliad* and 'A General View of the Epic Poem and of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Extracted from *Bossu*', which also discusses the *Aeneid* (*Twickenham Edition* 7: 3–25; 9: 3–24). Blair, too, comments on the importance of unity and invokes French priest and writer René Le Bossu (1631–89), possibly a source for Hume in addition to Blair and Pope.

22.3 **Peloponnesian war]** Thucydides' *History*, which Hume praises as 'the commencement of real history' ('Of the Populousness of Ancient Nations' 98), proposes that Sparta's fear of Athens' developing power was the primary cause of the war (beginning in 431 BC), though he also mentions additional interconnected causes.

22.4 **Siege of Athens]** The Siege of Athens occurred at the end of the Peloponnesian War, ending on 16 April 404. Subjected to a Spartan trap from land and sea, the city had no adequate defence against starvation. Athenians stood firm in heroic defiance until starvation increased to intolerable proportions. Athens was forced to accept Sparta's dictation of the terms of surrender. These events were recorded by Athenian historian Xenophon (5th–4th c. BC), *Hellenica* 2.2; Plutarch,[B] *Lives*, 'Lysander' 13–15; and historian Diodorus Siculus of Agyrium (1st c. BC), *The Library of History* 13.107.

22.5 **death of Alcibiades[B]]** In his younger years Alcibiades was considered among the most talented and promising Athenians, but his political ambition and power struggles contributed to the Athenians' defeat in the Peloponnesian War, in which he had a long involvement and a complex set of roles. Blessed with natural gifts and superbly educated, Alcibiades none the less suffered some form of tragic failure shortly after every major accomplishment. The Persian governor had him murdered. On his death by darts and arrows, see Plutarch,[B] *Lives*, 'Alcibiades' 39.

22.21 **Milton[B]]** John Milton's allegorical *Paradise Lost* deals with the biblical story of creation. The general subject of the work—human temptation, disobedience, and

the consequent loss of Paradise—is introduced in bk. 1. Bk. 7 describes how the world was first created; bks. 9–10 relate the Fall. Throughout the work divine providence is a unifying factor in what might otherwise appear to be disconnected events. English poet, critic, and political writer John Dennis (1657–1734), a champion of Milton, argued that part of Milton's greatness lay in his breaking through the rules of Aristotle[B] (*Critical Works*, 1: 333). For a related point made by Hume about resemblance and unity, see ann. 18.35 (on Ovid[B]). On Milton's representation of Adam, see *NHR* 1.6; and on his representation of the angels, see *THN* 2.3.8.9.

22.25 **battle of Pharsalia]** Pharsala—see ann. 95.2—was a city in Thessaly near which Julius Caesar conquered Roman military commander Pompey (1st c. BC). In the battle, called Pharsalia (from the name of the region around the town), Caesar took the right wing and Mark Antony the left. Hume may be alluding to the epic poem of Latin poet Lucan (1st c. AD), *Pharsalia* (also *The Civil War*), which deals with a larger set of causally related events in Roman history. Like Milton,[B] Lucan is concerned with self-destructive behaviour. Hume cites bks. 1 and 7 of Lucan's poem in his essay 'Of the Populousness of Ancient Nations' (n. 46).

23.12 **foreign to each other]** In *THN* 2.2.8.17 and *DIS* 4.11–14 Hume discusses problems of foreign elements that have been inappropriately mixed. See the treatment at *DIS* 4.10 and *THN* 2.2.8.18 (using the *Alma* and *Solomon* of English poet Matthew Prior (1664–1721) as examples). See also Horace, *Art of Poetry* 1–23, on poetic licence; and Addison,[B] *Spectator* 40, on the 'monstrous invention' of the tragicomedy.

SECTION 4

SECTION 4] This section shows similarities to *THN* 1.3.1, 6; see also *Abstract*, *passim*.

24.2 ***Relations of Ideas* and *Matters of Fact*]** Similarities to Hume's distinction between these two objects of reason and inquiry are apparent in the distinction in Malebranche[B] between (1) relations between ideas, (2) relations between things, and (3) relations between ideas and things (*Search after Truth* 6.1.5). The first falls into the category of necessary truths, whereas the second and third fall into the category of contingent truths. See related distinctions in Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, ch. 13 (Buroker, 263–5); Locke[B] on certainty, intuition, and demonstration (see ann. 32.30); and the criticisms of Malebranche in French philosopher Simon Foucher (1644–96), *Critique of the Search for the Truth* (Watson and Grene, 21–4, 30–1). See *THN* 1.3.1 for Hume's earlier treatment of this distinction.

24.3 **Geometry, Algebra, and Arithmetic]** Hume and Malebranche[B] (*Search after Truth* 6.1.5) both list geometry, algebra, and arithmetic as exemplars of relations of ideas and the demonstrative sciences. Hume's inclusion of geometry does

not follow the precedent in *THN* (see 1.3.1.4; cf. 1.4.1). Compare parallels in Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.1.1–5, 4.2.1, 4.4.18.

24.9 **never were a circle]** Compare Locke,[B] *Essay* 3.3.19, 4.4.8.

24.10 **Euclid[B]]** See ann. 49.28.

24.15 **imply a contradiction]** For discussions of this criterion, see *Dialogues* 9.5; and *Abstract* 11, 18. See also Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica* 23 (144); and John Wilkins, *Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion* 1.3.4 (cf. 1.1.3).

24.17 ***sun will not rise to-morrow***] See ann. n. 10; *THN* 1.3.11.2; and *Letter from a Gentleman* 26. This example of the sun, and observations similar to Hume's, are found in English philosopher William Wollaston (1659–1724), *Religion of Nature Delineated* 3.16 (57). The example was widely used in discussions of probability, evidence, and proof. See Hobbes, *Elements of Philosophy . . . concerning Body* 10.5 (*Works*, 1: 129–31), and *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance* 14 (5: 150–1); Butler, *Analogy*, introduction; John Wilkins, *Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion* 1.3.4; Dutch mathematician and philosopher W. James s' Gravesande (1688–1742), *Mathematical Elements of Natural Philosophy*, 'An Oration concerning Evidence', especially 1: xxxvi.

24.25 **little cultivated, either by the ancients or moderns]** To say 'little cultivated' is not to say there were no predecessors. Among the ancients Sextus Empiricus (*Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 2.204–8 (ch. 15)) rejects induction on grounds that particulars omitted in the induction may invalidate the universal. Among modern philosophers questions about evidence had been prominently discussed by Descartes[B] (*Meditations*) and Locke[B] (*Essay*); a clear statement about the nature of evidence is found in W. James s' Gravesande, 'An Oration concerning Evidence', in *Mathematical Elements of Natural Philosophy*.

24.29 **implicit faith]** An implicit faith is a belief based on the judgement or authority of faculties, sentiments, or parties that one deeply trusts. For other uses of 'implicit faith' in Hume's writings, see *Letters*, 1: 473 (to Gilbert Elliot of Minto); *History of England*, vol. 1, ch. 4, and vol. 4, ch. 40; *THN* 1.4.2.56; *NHR* 12.15; 'Of Parties in General' 13; and 'Of National Characters', n. 2. For philosophical and theological uses of the notion, see Hobbes, *Leviathan* 32.2, and *An Answer to Dr. Bramhall*, *Works*, 4: 382; Locke,[B] *Essay* 1.4.22, 2.33.17, 4.12.6, 4.17.4; Leibniz,[B] *New Essays* (pub. 1765) 4.17.4, 4.20.18; French counsellor and philosopher François de la Mothe Le Vayer (1588–1669), *De la vertu des payens*, 'De Pyrrhon' (298); Berkeley,[B] *Alciphron*, dialogue 6.18, 32; and Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'faith'. See also George Campbell's use (in commenting on Hume) in *A Dissertation on Miracles*, 77.

25.5 **All reasonings]** The nature of reasoning—here connected to the earlier account of ideas and their relations—is likely informed in this section by the treatment of reasoning in Locke,[B] Descartes,[B] and Arnauld[B] and Nicole.[B] See also ann. 32.30 on intuition and demonstration and the discussion of probability in ann. Section 6.

25.33 **examination of its sensible qualities]** Several of Hume's predecessors had observed that causality is unperceivable, that it is known only by repetition in experience, or that necessary connections are not present in sensory experience. See Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica* 23 (142), 25 (154), and *Essays*, 'Against Confidence in Philosophy', 16 ff.; Berkeley,[B] *Principles* 1.32, 103, and *Three Dialogues*, dials. 1–2; English natural philosopher Robert Boyle (1627–91), *The Christian Virtuoso* (*Works*, 5: 526–8).

25.34 **Adam]** Compare discussions of Adam or similar 'persons' in *Abstract* 11–14; *DIS* 2.47; *NHR* 1.6; and *THN* 2.1.6.9.

26.5 **pieces of marble]** This example of two smooth pieces of marble was widely mentioned as an instance of adherence—also called 'cohesion' at *EHU* 4.12. Hume uses the same example in *THN* 2.3.1.8. Boyle dealt theoretically and mechanically with the phenomenon of cohesion in two smooth bodies of marble (*New Experiments Physico-Mechanical, touching the Spring of the Air*, which gives a reference to *The History of Fluidity and Firmness*—both in *Works*, 1: 1–117, 377–442); *New Experiments* is one of the few works by Boyle found in the Hume Library. See also Hume's tribute to Boyle in *History of England*, ch. 71 (6: 541).) Locke[B] used the example several times (*Essay* 2.4.4–5, 2.23.23–4). It is also mentioned by Hobbes, *Seven Philosophical Problems* 3; and Italian natural philosopher Galileo Galilei (1564–1642), *Two New Sciences*, 19–20.

26.6 **natural philosophy]** 'Natural philosophy' is the study of causation in nature, the description of phenomena, and the properties and operations of natural bodies (see ann. 5.1 and 50.6). By the late 17th century Cartesian theory (see Descartes,[B] *Principles* 2–4) and the controversies it engendered were staple parts of university curricula. In the early 18th century leaders of the Royal Society were influential in replacing Cartesian theory with Newtonian theory and experimental philosophy.

For a range of examples of natural philosophy—all discussed elsewhere in these annotations—see Newton,[B] *Mathematical Principles* and *Opticks*; *Leibniz–Clarke Correspondence*; Boyle, *The Sceptical Chymist* and *Origin of Forms and Qualities According to the Corpuscular Philosophy*; English philosopher Kenelme Digby (1603–65), *Treatises*, First Treatise; Galileo, *Two New Sciences*; Scottish mathematician Colin Maclaurin (1698–1746), *An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries* (published after *EHU* was at the press); French natural philosopher Jacques Rohault (1620–72), *System of Natural Philosophy*; Scottish physician and philosopher George Cheyne (1671–1743), *Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion: Containing the Elements of Natural Philosophy*; and s' Gravesande, *Mathematical Elements of Natural Philosophy*.

26.11 **loadstone]** A loadstone, or lodestone, is an iron oxide mineral known for natural magnetic qualities. In free position, it aligns itself to the earth's poles. Early compasses were constructed from pieces of a lodestone, as Hume implies in a passage in *Dialogues* 8.10. Locke[B] used the lodestone as an example of a natural power (*Essay*

2.23.7); and Arnauld[B] and Nicole[B] present a speculative problem about the earth's rotation and the properties of the lodestone (*Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, ch. 2 (Buroker, 234, 236)). Treatments of magnetism and the lodestone are found in Descartes[B] (*Principles* 4.133–83); Malebranche[B] (*Search after Truth* 6.2.8); Kenelme Digby, *Treatises*, First Treatise 22.1–9; Boyle, *Some Considerations about the Reconcileableness of Reason and Religion* and *Experiments and Notes about the Mechanical Production of Magnetism* (*Works*, 4: 179–80, 340–5); English author and physician Thomas Browne (1605–82), *Pseudodoxia epidemica* 2.2; and many others. The classic *On the Loadstone and Magnetic Bodies* (1600) by English physician William Gilbert (1540–1603) deeply influenced this literature.

26.24 **billiard-ball]** This passage may be influenced by the thesis in Malebranche[B] that persons 'should not judge that a ball in motion is the true and principal cause of the movement of the ball it finds in its path. They can judge only that the collision of the two balls is the occasion for the Author of all motion in matter to carry out the decree of His will, which is the universal cause of all things' (*Search after Truth* 3.2.3 (224–5)). At 6.2.3 (448–50), Malebranche uses the example of the mind willing an arm to move, which Hume uses at *EHU* 7.13. See also Malebranche, *Dialogues on Metaphysics* 7.11. Hume first uses billiard-balls to illustrate the causal relation at *Abstract* 9.

26.25 **impulse]** collision or impact—a contact that causes motion. See also *EHU* 4.10, 12; 5.5, 11; 6.4; 7.6, 21, 25, 28. For Newton[B] on impulse, see *Mathematical Principles*, definition 8 (explanation, 4–6), and bk. 1, prop. 69, theor. 29, scholium. See also Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.8.11–13. Locke—influenced by Newton to modify his account of impulse—said that a moving billiard-ball 'by impulse . . . sets another Ball in motion' by communicating its motion to the second ball (*Essay* 2.21.4).

27.28 **no philosopher, who is rational and modest]** This paragraph presents a number of themes in experimental philosophy; see the next annotation for themes in Newton[B] and others.

27.29 **ultimate cause]** Natural philosophers were divided about the nature of ultimate causes, forces in nature, and the like. In *Letter from a Gentleman* 32 Hume (or his expository editor, Henry Home) offers the following opinions on the history of the problem: 'all the antient Philosophers agreed, that there was a real Force in Matter. . . . The Schoolmen supposed also a real Power in Matter. . . . No one, till *Des Cartes* and *Malbranche*, ever entertained an Opinion that Matter had no Force either *primary* or *secondary*, and *independent* or *concurrent*.' In *THN* Hume discusses Cartesians who believe that 'the ultimate force and efficacy of nature is perfectly unknown to us' and who place all ultimate causation in the deity (*THN* 1.3.14.8–9). See ann. Section 7.21–4 and the discussion of ultimate causes and principles three annotations below.

27.33 **greater simplicity]** a reference to the methodological principle called 'Ockham's Razor'. In *Dialogues* 5.9 (cf. *THN* 3.3.1.10) Hume portrays the principle as follows: 'To multiply causes, without necessity, is indeed contrary to true

philosophy.' Hume mentions Newton's rules below (*EHU* 8.4); the principle of simplicity is rule 1 in Newton's list.

27.38 **cohesion]** 'Cohesion of parts' of matter refers to the phenomenon of the parts of solid bodies adhering or sticking together; see ann. 26.5 on Hume's example of pieces of marble. Newton[B] was a basic source for these scientific concepts, and many philosophers had offered theories of the phenomenon. See ann. nn. 16–17 for Hume's interests in the scientific literature.

27.39 **ultimate causes and principles]** Experimental philosophy could be interpreted as rooted in methods designed to determine nature's ultimate causes and principles in so far as they can be discovered. In *Opticks* 3.1 (400–2) Newton[B] provides a summary of his views:

> permanent Particles . . . have not only a *Vis inertiæ* [see ann. n. 16 below] . . . but . . . are moved by certain active Principles, such as is that of Gravity, and that which causes Fermentation, and the Cohesion of Bodies. These Principles I consider, not as occult Qualities, supposed to result from the specifick Forms of Things, but as general Laws of Nature, by which the Things themselves are form'd; their Truth appearing to us by Phænomena, though their Causes be not yet discover'd. For these are manifest Qualities, and their Causes only are occult. And the *Aristotelians* gave the Name of occult Qualities, not to manifest Qualities, but to such Qualities only as they supposed to lie hid in Bodies, and to be the unknown Causes of manifest Effects: Such as would be the Causes of Gravity. . . . To tell us that every Species of Things is endow'd with an occult specifick Quality by which it acts and produces manifest Effects, is to tell us nothing: But to derive two or three general Principles of Motion from Phænomena, and afterwards to tell us how the Properties and Actions of all corporeal Things follow from those manifest Principles, would be a very great step in Philosophy, though the Causes of those Principles were not yet discover'd.

See, further, Newton,[B] *Mathematical Principles* 3, general scholium (Motte–Cajori, 547).

28.2 **trace up the particular phænomena]** Compare *THN* Introduction 8 on 'tracing . . . to the utmost', meaning following the direction of experiments where they take us in the attempt to understand a phenomenon.

28.4 **ignorance . . . ignorance]** These themes about ignorance resemble themes in Locke,[B] *Essay* 1.1.4–7, 4.3.22–9; Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 3.4.1.2, 5; and Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'ignorance'. See related discussions of ignorance in Montaigne, 'On Experience' (*Essays* 3.13) and 'Apology for Raymond Sebond' (*Essays* 2.12; Screech, 634); Boyle, 'Of Men's Great Ignorance' (*Works*, 3: 470 ff.); Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica: or Confest Ignorance* 1–6, 9–16; Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking* (fourth part, ch. 1; Buroker, 227–33); s' Gravesande, *Mathematical Elements of Natural Philosophy*, preface, pp. ii–iii; Browne, *Pseudodoxia epidemica* 1 ff.; and French mathematician and scientist Marin Mersenne (1588–1648), *La*

Vérité des sciences 1.2–3. Hume offers numerous comments on causal ignorance in his *Dialogues*.

28.12 **mixed mathematics]** 'Mixed mathematics' refers to mathematical applications in physical theory, as in mechanics. 'Mixed' contrasts with 'pure'. Galileo and Descartes[B] had envisioned natural philosophy fashioned on mixed mathematics, but Newton[B] was the first to quantify a sizeable realm of phenomena. See the Newtonian explanation of mixed mathematics in s' Gravesande, *Mathematical Elements of Natural Philosophy*, preface, 1: ii, and 'An Oration concerning Evidence', 1: xxxix.

28.18 **compound ratio . . . solid contents]** See Newton,[B] *Mathematical Principles*, definition 2; Maclaurin, *Newton's Philosophical Discoveries* 1.12 (2: 105–6). Hume's formulation is close to that of Maclaurin, who adds that 'There appears to be no ground for making a distinction between the *quantity of motion* [the term in Newton's second definition] and the *force* of a body in motion.' However, it is unlikely that Hume had seen Maclaurin's manuscript, published in 1748. For Maclaurin's teaching of Newton at Edinburgh, see Henderson, 'Short Account', 372.

28.21 **Geometry . . . discovery of the law]** Newton[B] insists that even if confirmed, *exact* mathematical formulations do not ensure the truth of a physical theory. Newton's rule 4 prescribes that:

> In experimental philosophy we are to look upon propositions inferred by general induction from phenomena as accurately or very nearly true, notwithstanding any contrary hypotheses that may be imagined, till such time as other phenomena occur, by which they may either be made more accurate, or liable to exceptions. (*Mathematical Principles* (400); see also definition 2, laws 1 and 3, and rules 1–3 (1, 13–14, 398–400).)

For other possible historical precedents for Hume's reflections in this paragraph, see Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.3.14, 26.

29.22 **powers . . . bread]** Malebranche[B] had used the example of bread (*Search after Truth* 6.2.2) to explicate causal relations without recourse to powers or to an intricate mechanism of parts. Hume initiated the example of bread at 4.7 above and pursues it at 4.21 below.

29.27 **wonderful force . . . distant conception]** Compare Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 6.2.3; and see ann. 26.24 on billiard-ball collision. See also Newton,[B] *Mathematical Principles*, laws 1 and 3. Maclaurin's *An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries* (pp. 112–16) is instructive, though not a likely source of Hume's knowledge of the relevant science.

30.23 **medium]** This term possibly refers to the middle term or proposition in a syllogism (Aristotelian syllogistic); see the useful body of definitions in Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'medium'. Hume's usage seems particularly close to the notion of intermediate ideas in demonstration and probability in Locke[B] (*Essay* 4.17.15–16); see *EHU* 4.21 below.

30.38 **two kinds]** See ann. 24.2 for this division of two types of reasoning and proposition, namely *relations of ideas* and *matters of fact*.

31.13 **probable only]** Compare Gassendi's arguments to show that it is not possible to demonstrate the universality of propositions arrived at by induction (*Exercises Against the Aristotelians* 2.5.5, citing Aristotle[B] and Porphyry); see also his views about probability and the criterion of truth (*Syntagma*: Logic 2.5). Bacon[B] held that induction determines various 'degrees of certainty' (see *Novum organum* 1 and preface); compare Hume's idea of 'proofs' (see n. 10). See also the related use of probability in Locke[B] (*Essay* 4.15), who rejects the language of 'certainty'. Hume's *Abstract* contains a succinct statement of his views on induction.

31.18 **experimental conclusions]** See ann. 5.1 and *THN* Introduction 7 and 1.3.15.11; this work bears the subtitle *An Attempt to introduce the experimental Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects*. Hume uses 'experimental' to include observation as well as experimentation. On *experimental conclusions*, compare Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.3.29; and Hobbes, *Leviathan* 3.7–8, 10.

31.28 **guide of human life]** Cf. *EHU* 5.6. Hume may have been influenced by Cicero[B] and Butler. Cicero maintained that 'many sensations are *probable*, that is, though not amounting to a full perception they are yet possessed of a certain distinctness and clearness, and so can serve to direct the conduct of the wise man' (*De natura deorum* 1.5.12). Compare Butler's celebrated thesis about probability as 'the very guide of life' (*Analogy*, introduction); Wollaston, *Religion of Nature Delineated* 3.16; and Hume, *Abstract* 4, which mentions the insights of Leibniz,[B] Locke,[B] Malebranche,[B] and Arnauld[B] and Nicole.[B]

32.30 **intuitive . . . demonstrative]** The intuitive is that which is known immediately to the apprehending mind; it is self-evident and independent of inference or reasoning (though in some theories known through reason). The demonstrative is an uninterrupted sequence of self-evident steps in reasoning. For an influential treatment, see Descartes's *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, esp. rule 3 (1: 14–15), and *Discourse on the Method* 2. See also Locke's definitions of *intuition* and *demonstration* and his use of the expressions 'intuitive Knowledge' and 'demonstrative Knowledge', *Essay* 4.2.1–14. Descartes[B] and Locke,[B] like Hume (in some passages, esp. in *THN*), excluded probable belief from the category of knowledge. See Hume's use of the various interconnected notions at *EHU* 4.1, 16, 18, 21; n. 10; n. 18; *THN* 1.3.1.2, 1.3.7.3, 1.3.14.35, 1.4.1.1; and *Abstract* 18.

SECTION 5

35.7 **philosophic sage]** For philosophical writings on the ideal wise person or sage, see the Stoic Seneca (1st c. AD), especially 'On Tranquillity of Mind' 2.4 (in *Moral Essays*), and Epicurus[B] (*Epicurus Reader*, texts 3.85–7; 4.128–31; 9; 16.53). For

further information on Hume's views, see 'Epictetus . . .', immediately below; *EPM* 7.16; *NHR* 12.22; 'The Stoic' 5, 12–13, 18.

35.9 **Epictetus,[B] and other Stoics]** The Stoics, among them Epictetus, recommended freedom from control by the passions and the demands of public life. Epictetus' teaching centred on reflective self-examination (*Discourses* 1.6) and moral purpose (*Discourses* 1.4, 1.18.15–20); on tranquillity and the sage, see *Discourses* 2.2. See also ann. 76.24 and 91.4; Hume's comments on the Stoics and Epictetus at *EPM* 7.16–17 and Appx. 4.14; and *NHR* 12.22.

35.9 **system of selfishness]** The reference is to the Stoic preference, especially in Epictetus,[B] for a focus on cultivation of the self (self-mastery, self-salvation, and the like). For Epictetus' views, see the previous annotation and *Discourses* 2.11; *Fragments* 14. For Seneca's views, see 'De beneficiis' 4.1–3, in *Moral Essays*, where he criticizes Epicureans for viewing virtue as the vehicle of pleasure. In *EPM* Appx. 2.3–4 Hume refers to Hobbes, Locke,[B] and other philosophers, including 'Epicurus and his sect', as proponents of 'the selfish system of morals'.

35.18 **Academic or Sceptical philosophy]** See *EHU* 12. 'Academics' is here a term for a type of sceptic and does not merely designate those such as Arcesilas (4th–3rd c. BC) and Carneades (3rd–2nd c. BC), who shaped the history of Plato's Academy. Cicero,[B] one of Hume's most frequently cited authors, was influenced by teachings of the Academics. See especially *Academica* and *De natura deorum* 1.5.11–12.

35.19 **talk of doubt and suspence of judgment]** See Cicero,[B] *Academica* 1.12.45, 2.18.59, 2.31, 2.32.103–4, 2.46.141, on the academic sceptics' position.

35.28 **groundless reproach and obloquy]** Ancient philosophers such as Epictetus[B] (*Discourses* 1.5, 'Against the Academics') and modern philosophers such as Malebranche[B] (*Search after Truth* 1.20.3, 2.3.5) harshly judged academic sceptics.

36.17 **sudden into this world]** Compare the example of Adam at *EHU* 4.6; *Abstract* 11–14; *DIS* 2.47; *THN* 2.1.6.9.

37.1 **custom or habit]** In *Abstract* 15–21 Hume connects his account of custom to what he calls in the subtitle of that work the 'chief argument' of his *Treatise*. See also *THN* 1.3.6, 1.3.8.10–14, 1.3.13.9–11, 1.3.14, 2.3.1.16, 2.3.5. Compare the treatments of custom (and habit) in Blaise Pascal,[B] *Pensées* 67, 94, 158–9, 454, 661, 680 (Levi nos.); Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.33.6–7; and Hutcheson, *Inquiry into the Original*, Treatise 1, 7.

37.13 **constant conjunction]** Hume makes related comments on constant conjunction in *THN* 1.1.1.8; 1.3.6.3–4, 8, 11–16; 1.3.11.11; 1.3.12.25; 1.3.14.12, 31–3; 1.3.15.1.

n. 8 **Tiberius[B] or a Nero[B]]** The reign of the Julio-Claudian emperors began with Tiberius' ascendancy in AD 14 and ended with Nero's death in AD 68. In *EPM* 5.34 Hume makes a related comment and invokes accounts of these emperors found in

Suetonius[B] (see *Lives of the Caesars* 3, 'Tiberius', and 6, 'Nero') and Tacitus[B] (see *Annals* 16.21–35).

39.20 **natural instincts]** This controversy about the roles of instinct and reason is explored below in Section 9, especially 9.6). See also *Abstract* 6, where Hume proposes that 'all our passions are a kind of natural instincts, derived from nothing but the original constitution of the human mind'. Hume may have been influenced by many since Aristotle[B] who have employed the language of 'natural instinct'. For a spectrum of modern opinion, see Lord Herbert of Cherbury, *De veritate*, 'Instinctus naturalis'; Montaigne, 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 512); Gassendi, 'Letter to Diodati' (Brush, 111); Leibniz,[B] *New Essays* (pub. 1765) 1.2.3, 9; Pascal,[B] *Pensées* 25 and 176 (Levi nos.); and French philosopher Julien Offray de La Mettrie (1709–51), *Machine Man*, 13. See also the uses of 'natural instinct' in *EHU* 9.3, 12.7, 12.16, and 12.25.

39.35 **PART 2]** Excepting the final two paragraphs in part 2, the theory of belief in this part is related to material in *THN* 1.3.5, 7–8 (see also Appendix 2–9) and *Abstract* 16–22.

40.6 **fiction and belief]** In some works, but not *EHU*, Hume uses 'fiction' to refer to an invention of mind that is neither voluntary nor arbitrary. For a theory of non-voluntary invention, see *THN* 1.1.6.2 and 1.4.3.5; see also *THN* 1.4.3.1, 4–7; 1.4.4.2; 1.4.5.3.

40.9 **voluntarily annex . . . not in our power to believe]** This thesis that belief is involuntary may be a challenge to the Cartesian theory (with less extreme predecessors in the Stoics and St Augustine) that judgement is a matter of voluntary assent. In Descartes's account affirming or denying propositions (as well as abstaining from making judgements) is free activity traceable to the will. See *Meditations* 4 (*Philosophical Works*, 1: 39–42).

40.11 **man . . . horse]** Hobbes (*Leviathan* 2.4) and Berkeley[B] (*Principles*, introduction 10) discuss combining man and horse in the imagination. See also the opening lines of Roman poet Horace (1st c. BC), *Art of Poetry*, on connecting a human head to the neck of a horse and the discussion of joining parts of man and horse in Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.32.25.

40.40 **belief . . . vivid, lively]** For a fuller development of these ideas about the nature of belief, see *THN* 1.3.7.5–7; 1.3.8.11, 15; 1.3.9.8. At 1.3.7.5 Hume says that the notion of belief 'may be most accurately defin'd [as] A LIVELY IDEA RELATED TO OR ASSOCIATED WITH A PRESENT IMPRESSION'.

42.29 **plead in excuse for the mummeries]** refers to the defence of certain religious rituals, ceremonies, rites, or performances. Protestants used the term 'mummeries' derogatorily to suggest ceremonial masquerading. This notion was associated with Roman Catholic beliefs and rituals that seemed superstitious to Protestants, such as the belief that the Host (the wafer) becomes the body of Christ when consecrated. A virtually identical passage occurs at *THN* 1.3.8.4.

n. 9 **de finibus]** Footnote reference: Cicero,[B] *De finibus bonorum et malorum* 5.1.2. While passing an afternoon at the Academy, Piso (a character in Cicero's dialogue) discusses the power of the setting to intensify emotions and focus thinking. Hume quotes Piso's comments on the stimulation of his ideas of historical figures while near the Academy and the senate building:

> Why are we more affected, asked Piso, when we learn that the places we see were often frequented by famous men than we are when we hear a report of the same men's exploits or read a written account of them? Is it a natural endowment we have, or is it some sort of aberration? I feel the effect now, for example. For I am put in mind of Plato, who we are told was the first to practise disputation here; indeed the adjoining gardens not only bring him back to mind but seem to place the man himself before my eyes. Here is Speusippus, here Xenocrates, and here his follower Polemo: The bench we see over there was Polemo's. In the same way, even when looking at our own senate building—I mean the Hostilia, not the new building, which looks slighter to me since it was enlarged—I used to think of Scipio, Cato, Laelius, and especially my grandfather. So great is the suggestive power of places, that it is no accident that they shape our memory training.

Speusippus,[B] Xenocrates,[B] and Polemo[B] were, in the order listed, the three immediate successors of Plato[B] as heads of the Academy in Athens, from 347 to 313. Scipio Aemelianus,[B] Cato the Elder,[B] and Laelius[B] were Roman military and political figures admired by Cicero for their outstanding qualities.

A virtually identical paragraph and an identical passage from Cicero's *De finibus* appears in *THN* 1.3.8.5 n. (originally published in the Appendix), although variants appear in the Latin.

43.19 **relicts of saints and holy men]** Several books on this subject were available to Hume, among them Edward Gee, *The Texts Examined which Papists cite . . . concerning the Worship of Images and Relics* (originally published 1688) and the famous work by Jean Calvin, *Traitté des reliques*, which had been translated into English. Relics were discussed in several works referred to below in the annotations for Section 10.

44.29 **pre-established harmony]** a term derived from the 'harmonie préetablie' of Leibniz.[B] In *Dialogues* 10.6 Hume appends (in a similar context) the footnote 'That sentiment had been maintained by Dr King and some few others before Leibnitz; though by none of so great fame as that German philosopher.' The first reference is to William King (1650–1729), archbishop of Dublin; see his *Essay on the Origin of Evil* 2–3, 5.5.2–3. Leibniz held that God created every individual atomic unit in the universe so that whatever happens to each such unit is the result of its nature. See *Leibniz–Arnauld Correspondence*, 23 Mar. 1690, and *Theodicy* (Farrer–Huggard, 133, 157, 245, 304, 337).

45.1 ***final causes***] a term derived from Aristotle's account of the four causes or four types of change in nature (*Physics*, 198[a]14–[b]19; *Metaphysics* 1013[a]24–[b]28). Like

'pre-established harmony', 'final cause' can refer to the purposes, ends, goals, or designs in nature. For 'those, who delight' in final causes, see Boyle, *A Disquisition about the Final Causes of Natural Things* (*Works*, 5: 392–444). Gassendi, Leibniz,[B] and Newton[B] discussed final causes favourably, as did Keill in *An Examination of Dr. Burnet's Theory of the Earth* . . . (63–4) and French mathematician Abraham de Moivre (1667–1754), in *The Doctrine of Chances* (252); but no treatment rivals Boyle's for comprehensiveness. See, further, Hume's mention of final causes in *Dialogues* 2.9, 14; 3.7; 4.13; 6.4; 10.37.

45.2 **wonder and admiration]** Pope (*Essay on Man*, epistle 1, especially lines 281–94; epistle 3, lines 1–26, 111–14) was one of those who shared features of the optimistic outlook on harmony found in Leibniz.[B]

SECTION 6

PROBABILITY] *THN* 1.3 also treats the subject of knowledge and probability; *EHU* 6 corresponds in important respects to *THN* 1.3.11–13. See also *THN* 1.3.2 and passages on probability beginning 1.3.6.4. The notion of probability had a rich history in philosophy, mathematics, and science, and several controversies surrounded the interpretation of probability and chance during the 17th and 18th centuries. Prominent figures included Pascal[B] and Pierre de Fermat (1601–65) ('Letters between Fermat and Pascal'), Arnauld[B] and Nicole[B] (*Logic or the Art of Thinking*), French mathematician J. Bernoulli (1654–1705) (*Ars conjectandi* 3), French mathematician Pierre Rémond de Montmort (1678–1719) (*Essay d'analyse sur les jeux de hazard*), and de Moivre (*Doctrine of Chances*). See also Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.15, and the 'Correspondence between Leibnitz and Bernoulli', in *Translations from James Bernoulli* (on estimating probabilities). Hume's positions are in the tradition descending from Arnauld–Nicole and Locke.

For modern scholarship on the development of theories of probability, see Lorraine Daston, *Classical Probability in the Enlightenment*; Ian Hacking, *The Emergence of Probability*; Barbara Shapiro, *Probability and Certainty in Seventeenth-Century England*; Anders Hald, *A History of Probability and Statistics and their Applications before 1750*; and F. N. David, *Games, Gods and Gambling*.

n. 10 **Mr. Locke[B] divides all arguments]** Footnote reference: John Locke, *An Essay concerning Human Understanding* 4.15–16. See also *Essay* 4.1–3 on knowledge, probability, and evidence. Prior to the publication of Locke's *Essay* in 1690 several British thinkers had examined divisions of arguments, degrees of evidence, and legitimate grounds of assent. Their purposes were often grounded in religious interests. Examples include Wilkins, *Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion* 1.1 and 1.3; physician and philosopher Walter Charleton (1619/20–1707), *The Immortality of the Soul Demonstrated by the Light of Nature*, 'Dialogue the Second', 186–8; Boyle, *Reconcileableness of Reason and Religion* 8 (*Works*, 4: 93–7); Glanvill, sermon 3: 'Moral Evidence of a Life to Come', in *Seasonable Reflections and Discourses*; and John Tillotson,[B] 'The Wisdom of Being Religious' (*Works*, sermon 1).

n. 10 ***demonstrations, proofs*, and *probabilities***] See Locke[B] on the distinction between 'proofs' and 'demonstrations' and analysis of 'demonstration' (*Essay* 4.2.1–4, 4.15.1–4, 4.16.6–9). Locke regards 'demonstration' as necessarily including 'proof' as an element; unlike Hume's treatment, Locke's is not a distinction between two degrees of the same sort of thing. Locke uses 'proof' to refer to what we might consider the steps in a proof. Hume's distinction therefore does not entirely parallel Locke's.

John Laird (relying in part on Baxter) maintained that Hume 'borrowed this threefold division from the Chevalier Ramsay' (Laird, *Hume's Philosophy*, 90 and n.). This hypothesis is based on *The Travels of Cyrus* 6, where expatriate Scottish philosopher and tutor Andrew Michael Ramsay (1686–1743) used similar terminology and ideas. (Hume obliquely refers to this book by Ramsay at *NHR*, n. 87. A 1757 edn. is in the Hume Library.) Ramsay's hierarchy of three degrees (see *Travels of Cyrus*, 1: xix–xxiv; 2: 52–3, 62) is closer to Hume's usage than Locke's two degrees, suggesting that Hume may be following Ramsay rather than Locke. However, no additional evidence confirms that Hume was indebted to Ramsay for the distinction.

Some of Hume's predecessors offered similar distinctions. See, for example, Wilkins, *Principles and Duties of Natural Religion* 1.3.3–5 (where '*indubitable* certainty' is contrasted to infallible certainty and fallibility). In Wilkins and other figures, such as Tillotson,[B] this view is related to the distinction between metaphysical and moral certainty, elaborated in ann. Section 10.3–4.

In *THN* 1.3.11.2 Hume proposes that we 'distinguish human reason into three kinds, viz. *that from knowledge* [rational demonstration or truths of reason], *from proofs* [causal arguments free of doubt and uncertainty], *and from probabilities* [arguments from probability, which are inferior in certainty and evidence to those causal arguments that are free of doubt and uncertainty]'. He notes that although the gradation from proofs to probabilities is 'insensible' in many cases, they are distinct categories.

46.1 ***Chance***] The ancient contrast between chance and causation diminished with the rise of modern accounts of probability. 'Chance' became associated with unpredictability, luck, fortune, risk, and hazard, rather than the absence of causes. The thesis that 'chance' and related terms are mere words without corresponding realities is found in Collins, *Human Liberty*, 107; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'chance'; English clergyman, classical scholar, and master of Trinity College, Cambridge, Richard Bentley (1662–1742), 'A Confutation of Atheism . . . Third and Last Part' (Fifth Boyle Lecture), 6–13; and Clarke,[B] *Sermons on Several Subjects*, sermon 98 (*Works*, 1: 619). Variants of the same thesis are found in Wollaston, *Religion of Nature Delineated* 5.14; and de Moivre, *Doctrine of Chances* (252–3; compare preface). See also *EHU* 8.25; *Dialogues* 9.3 ('*Chance* is a word without a meaning'); and *THN* 1.3.11.4–7, 1.3.12.1.

46.1 **ignorance of the real cause**] Probability theorists often assumed determinism (what Hume treats in Section 8 as 'necessity') and condemned belief in the real existence of chance or fortune. Paradoxically, figures such as Bernoulli, de Moivre,

and French mathematician and political theorist the marquis de Condorcet (Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat; 1743–94) gave meaning to 'chance', and allowed for a theory of chance, only to deny that it exists in reality.

46.4 **superiority of chances on any side]** Games of chance and underlying probabilities were subjects of both intellectual and moral interest in the 18th century. Mathematicians such as Bernoulli (*Ars conjectandi* 3) and de Moivre (*Doctrine of Chances*) investigated the superiority of chances. See Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'gaming', and *THN* 1.3.11, 'Of the probability of chances'.

46.13 **process of the thought or reasoning]** Hume is discussing quantitative computation and belief proportional to past frequency. Often, however, 'probability' is linked to reasoning, reasonableness, and reasonable belief. See the accounts in Gassendi, Arnauld,[B] Boyle, Bernoulli, Pascal,[B] Butler, and Wilkins, to list figures mentioned elsewhere in these annotations. See also 'probabilité' in the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and D'Alembert.

46.17 **dye . . . particular side]** Compare Hume's discussion of dice, sides, probability, and related topics in *THN* 1.3.11.6. For similar views about probability and the use of dice in a work with which Hume was familiar, see Wollaston, *Religion of Nature Delineated* 3.16 (56, 59).

Numerous works on probability and gaming had used the example of dice to illustrate basic problems, propositions, and theories. Early and influential treatments of dice in probability theory included Gerolamo Cardano (1501–76), *Liber de ludo aleæ* (*The Book on Games of Chance*, in *Cardano: The Gambling Scholar*), especially chs. 7–13. Later and more expansive treatises of imposing historical importance in which the example appears include Montmort, *Essay*, preface and third part, 'Explication de ce jeu' (1713 2nd edn., pp. iii–xxiv, 173–215); Bernoulli, *Ars conjectandi* 3; and de Moivre, *Doctrine of Chances*, 9–24, 37-8, 41, 44-5, 51–5, 123–8, 160–1. See also the discussions of dice in Pascal[B] and Fermat ('Letters between Fermat and Pascal', especially 229–50).

46.19 **entirely equal]** The thesis that chances are equal when frequencies are equal is presented in more detail in *THN* 1.3.11.5, 8, 12; 1.3.12.15.

47.5 **probability of causes, as with that of chance]** See *THN* 1.3.12, which is entitled 'Of the probability of causes'; and *THN* 1.3.11, entitled 'Of the probability of chances'.

47.10 **universal law]** See the quotation from Newton,[B] *Opticks* 3.1, in ann. 27.39. *THN* 1.3.12.16 presents an account of gravity that resembles Cotes's 1713 preface to Newton's *Mathematical Principles* (2nd edn.):

> the attractive force of the entire bodies arises from and is composed of the attractive forces of the parts, because . . . if the bulk of the matter be augmented or diminished, its power is proportionately augmented or diminished. We must therefore conclude that the action of the earth is composed of the united actions of its parts, and therefore that all terrestrial bodies must attract one

another mutually. . . . This is the nature of gravity upon earth. (Motte–Cajori, p. xxii.)

47.12 **rhubarb . . . purge, or opium a soporific]** A purge is a cathartic (cleansing) or scouring medicine, here a laxative. Rhubarb was sometimes used as a purge to produce evacuations of the bowels, but it did not always bring about the desired effect. Opium contains morphine and acts as a narcotic. Opium was sometimes given to patients, but it too did not always bring about the desired effect. Exactly the same examples of opium and rhubarb were used to illustrate irregularity and uncertainty in Locke, *Essay* 4.3.25, and Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'ignorance'. Leibniz[B] then reproduced the same examples from Locke in *New Essays* (pub. 1765) 4.3.25. See also Johnson's *Dictionary* ('opium') and Hume's use of these examples in *Abstract* 32.

47.14 **irregularity . . . secret causes . . . prevented the operation]** Compare Clarke,[B] *Sermons on Several Subjects*, sermon 98 (*Works*, 1: 617–21); Bernoulli, *Ars conjectandi* 4.1–3; and de Moivre, *Doctrine of Chances*. On secret causes, see the similar view in Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.16.12.

47.29 **frost . . . open]** 'Open' here means clear and free from frost. Butler used the example of expecting frost in England in January and the role of probable judgements (*Analogy*, introduction) during his discussion of the Indian prince example that Hume presents at *EHU* 10.10.

47.31 **approaches to a certainty]** presumably a conclusion based on exceptionless evidence (not merely high probability) of a phenomenon. See the exposition, with a similar emphasis, in Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.16.6–9; and Wollaston, *Religion of Nature Delineated* 3.16 (57).

48.4 **common theories]** 'Received systems' are presumably here identical to the 'common theories'. These theories treated *knowledge*, *understanding*, and *demonstration*, but lacked serious treatment of *probability*, which falls short of knowledge. At *Abstract* 4 Hume indicates that the 'common systems' of Locke,[B] Malebranche[B] (see previous citations for both), and Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking* (fourth part, chs. 6–15; Buroker, 246–73) all emphasize understanding and demonstration, while failing to address questions of 'probabilities, and those other measures of evidence on which life and action entirely depend, and which are our guides even in most of our philosophical speculations'. Hume there attributes to Leibniz[B] insights about defects in these theories.

SECTION 7

49.2 **clear and determinate]** Hume is presumably following Locke,[B] who had decided that the Cartesian language of 'clear and distinct ideas' was inexact. He declared that he had '*in most places chose to put* determinate *or* determined, *instead of* clear *and* distinct. . . . *By* determinate, *when applied to a* simple Idea, *I mean that*

simple appearance, which the Mind has in its view, or perceives in it self, when that Idea is said to be in it' (*Essay*, Epistle to the Reader, 13). Locke used the language of 'clear and distinct ideas' regularly in his first three editions, and never succeeded in entirely removing it from his text.

49.6 **ellipsis . . . scalenum]** An ellipsis is an oval figure cut obliquely from the section of a cone (not parallel to the base, which would be a circle). A scalenum is a scalene triangle, which has sides of unequal length.

49.28 **Euclid[B]]** 'Geometry' was sometimes referred to as 'Euclid', and Euclid's *Elements* was still a standard manual in Hume's era. Hume mentions Euclid in several works; in *THN* 1.2.4 he uses Euclidean notions and definitions (of 'point', 'surface', 'rectilineal figure', etc.), but does not name Euclid.

50.6 **natural philosophy . . . physics]** 'Natural philosophy' (see ann. 5.1) and 'physics' were sometimes used as synonyms in the 18th century.

50.14 **obscure and uncertain . . . *power*, *force*, *energy*, or *necessary connexion*]** In *THN* 1.3.14.7 Hume complained of the 'prodigious diversity' of philosophical opinions on this issue—citing Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 6.2.3. Malebranche denies both that objective necessary connections between items in nature can be discovered and that there is real causal interaction between these items; true connections are between the will of God and created (or re-created) entities. When Hume criticizes the notion of objective necessary connection, he may be criticizing this doctrine in Malebranche. None the less, as *THN* 1.3.14.7 and 1.4.5.31 suggest, Hume's account of necessary connection may be most heavily indebted to Malebranche.

50.26 **Complex ideas . . . simple ideas]** For the philosophical background of Hume's views on simple and complex ideas, see Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.2, 2.11.6–7, 2.12, 3.4.6–7. Locke discussed how the mind compounds ideas, as did Addison[B] (*Spectator* 416). Both mention an associationist theory that in some respects resembles Hume's in Section 3; see ann. 17.1 and the more extended analysis in *THN* 1.1.1.2–10; 1.1.4.1, 7; 1.1.6.3; 1.1.7.14.

51.12 **the whole that appears to the *outward* senses]** This theme is found in Malebranche[B] and other occasionalists (see ann. Section 7.21); sceptical origins are found in Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 3.13–19 (chs. 4–5). Locke[B] acknowledged that we do not observe causal powers through the outward senses, but was confident that these powers exist, that we can detect them in our own agency, and that they are needed to explain causal relations; see ann. n. 12 and 52.5.

51.25 **Solidity]** Compare Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.4. Solidity is a spatio-temporal primary quality (though Cartesians disputed its existence)—see ann. Section 12.15 below and the numerous uses of this notion in *THN*.

51.29 **machine . . . concealed from us]** Theses about the overambitious claims of some writers to discover hidden causes are basic to Hume's arguments about science (the present context) and religious belief (in Section 11 below). On the

'whole machine'—that is, the entire universe—see Hume's *Dialogues* 2.5, 18; 7.14; 11.11; 12.5.

n. 12 **Locke[B] . . . chapter of power]** Footnote reference: John Locke, *An Essay concerning Human Understanding* 2.21. See especially sects. 1–16. Hume gives a near-identical reference to Locke in a note in *THN* 1.3.14.5. At 2.21.1 (see also 2.2.2 and 2.7.8) Locke discusses how the mind 'comes by that *Idea* which we call *Power*'.

52.5 **internal power]** See 7.16 below. For the thesis that the 'operations of our own minds' furnish a basis for 'the idea of power', see Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.1.2–4; 2.7.8; 2.21.1–5; 2.22.2, 10; 2.23.28, 33; 3.6.11; English clergyman Henry Lee (d. 1713), *Anti-Scepticism: Or, Notes upon Each Chapter of Mr. Lock's Essay* 2.19.2–3; Leibniz,[B] *New Essays* (pub. 1765) 2.21–3; Irish philosopher and Anglican bishop Peter Browne (d. 1735), *The Procedure, Extent, and Limits of Human Understanding*, 387–8. On Locke[B] and felt power, compare ann. n. 12.

52.26 **supposed spiritual substance]** Compare *THN* 1.4.6 on personal identity and *Dialogues* 6.5 on spiritual substance. See also the struggle between Hylas and Philonous over 'spiritual substance' in Berkeley,[B] *Dialogues* 3 (also *Principles* 1.139). Hume may be directing these statements primarily at Descartes[B] and his followers for their views on substance, continuance, identity, and interaction. Presumably anyone who accepted Cartesian dualism is a target, including Locke.[B]

52.33 **nature of both these substances]** Hume's discussion of substance is here directed to the 'secret union of soul and body'. Broader discussions of substance appear in *THN* 1.1.6, 1.4.3.1–8, 1.4.5.2–6; see also *Abstract* 28 and 'Of the Immortality of the Soul' 3, 5–6. Hume's belief that experience does not penetrate to a deeper substance had been anticipated by Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.13.18–9; 2.23.1–4, 37; 3.5.3—and developed on Lockean assumptions in Irish philosopher John Toland (1670–1722), *Christianity Not Mysterious* 3.2.

53.16 **anatomy . . . power in voluntary motion]** Paris and Edinburgh had emerged as centres of instruction in anatomy. However, Hume's argument here may rely on passages in Malebranche.[B] See *Search after Truth* 6.2.3, Elucidation 15. See also ann. 8.15.

53.18 **animal spirits]** nerves or nervous spirits; the system that makes sensation and voluntary motion possible—a thin nerve fluid or humour inside narrow tubes and pores. This fluid was thought to be the material source of nervous transmission in animals and humans. See references and definitions in Chambers, *Cyclopædia*: 'animal spirits', 'brain', 'memory', 'passion', and 'spirits' (and eight appearances of 'animal spirits' in *THN*). Many ancient physicians believed in animal spirits. A modern proponent in the medical community was English physician and professor of natural philosophy Thomas Willis (1621–75), who is discussed below in ann. Section 9; see his *Cerebri anatome* 11. Cheyne, by contrast, maintained that the 'contriv'd' and 'dark' hypothesis of animal spirits is unconfirmed (*The English Malady* 1.9).

Hume's source could have been Malebranche,[B] who used 'animal spirits' in the passage cited immediately above and in a related discussion of anatomy and volition; see *Search after Truth* 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 5.1, with a favourable citation of Descartes's 'treatise *De l'homme*'. See Descartes,[B] *Treatise on Man* (*Philosophical Writings*, 1: 100–7); *Passions of the Soul* 1.7–16, 34–49; and Letter to Vorstius (*Philosophical Writings*, 3: 225–6). Étienne Gilson's *Index Scolastico-Cartésien* ('esprits animaux') contains a useful body of references on animal spirits.

54.20 **power . . . entirely beyond our comprehension]** This argument concerning power and actions of mind resembles arguments in Malebranche,[B] though the reference to an infinite being does not follow Malebranche's view on divine causation (see *Search after Truth* 6.2.3 and Elucidation 15). Hume might be using Malebranche's premisses to turn the argument against him.

n. 13 ***nisus***] impulse or effort. *Nisus* is defined in Hume's Index (below) as 'strong endeavour'. The concept of *nisus* was developed by Aristotelian philosophers, who held that movement throughout nature derives from the operation of a principle that is analogous to desire or endeavour. This *nisus* drives objects to develop. See also n. 17.

55.30 **invisible intelligent principle]** See Hume's introduction to *NHR* (and also *NHR* 2.2, 2.5, 3.4, 4.1, 5.2, 8.2, 15.5), where he presents the thesis that, with a few exceptions, belief in 'invisible, intelligent power' has been 'diffused over all persons in all nations and ages'.

n. 14 Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς] This phrase means 'god out of a machine'. The expression derives from Hellenic and Roman drama, in which a 'deity', represented by an actor, interceded in human affairs. Some playwrights, including Euripides (5th c. BC), ended certain dramas by using a mechanical device to lower to the stage a god who solved problems generated by human situations by using superior judgement and commands. See Plato,[B] *Cratylus* 425d–426a; Aristotle,[B] *Poetics* 1454[b].

Leibniz[B] uses the equivalent Latin expression, 'deus ex machina', to denounce the metaphysical hypothesis that Hume here has under consideration. Leibniz regarded the God of the occasionalists as a *deus ex machina* for resolving the mind–body problem. He maintained that occasionalists lack an 'explanation drawn from the order of secondary causes' and take 'recourse to miracle' (*Primary Truths* and *A New System of the Nature and Communication of Substances*, in *Philosophical Essays*, 33, 143–5). See also reports on Leibniz and this problem in Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Rorarius' [H].

The expression Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς is of unknown origins, though it apparently became proverbial in post-Renaissance literature. In his 1748 (first) edition, Hume used in the text the phrase '*quasi Deus ex machina*'—like a god out of a machine. In 1750 this Latin version was moved to a footnote ('*Quasi Deus ex machina*. Cic. de Nat. Deorum'), then deleted in subsequent editions. This reference was apparently to Cicero's *De natura deorum* 1.20.53. However, Cicero[B] does not use either 'Quasi deus ex machina' or 'Deus ex machina'. His text reads: 'Quod quia quem ad modum

natura efficere sine aliqua mente possit non videtis, ut tragici poetae cum explicare argumenti exitum non potestis confugitis ad deum' ('For in so far as you cannot see how nature can cause this without some intelligent mind, you have recourse to a god, like the tragic poets when unable to arrange the conclusion of a plot'). Hume apparently viewed Cicero as referring to the phenomenon, not as using the phrase.

55.37 **many philosophers]** In a similar passage in *THN* 1.4.5.31 Hume provides a footnote to 'Father *Malebranche* and other *Cartesians*'. His reference there, and here, is to Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* (6.2.3 and Elucidations 1 and 15, especially reply to the sixth proof) and to other occasionalists; see also ann. n. 16. Philosophers who thought that 'the energy of the cause is . . . unintelligible' in the relevant sense include Berkeley.[B]

56.3 **sole cause of every event]** Occasionalists who held this or a closely related view about divine causation included Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 6.2.3 (cf. 3.2.3 and *Dialogues on Metaphysics*, dial. 7); French occasionalist philosopher Gerauld (Géraud) de Cordemoy (*c*.1620–84), *Six discours sur la distinction & l'union du corps & de l'ame*, 'Discours 4—De la première cause du mouvement' (*Œuvres*, 136–40, 143–4, especially conclusions 3–4 and axiom 5); French physician and philosopher Louis de La Forge (1632–66), *Traitté de l'esprit de l'homme* 16, especially pp. 251–9 (1666 edn.); German Cartesian philosopher Johannes Clauberg (1622–65), *Disputationes physicæ* 13, 17–18, in *Opera omnia philosophica*. These occasionalists were building on Descartes,[B] who suggests that God is the cause of both the motion of bodies (and that this moving force is not in the bodies themselves) and the acts and effects of the human will; see *Principles of Philosophy*, 1: 24, 40–1 (*Philosophical Writings*, 1: 201, 206); *Objections and Replies* 3 (*Philosophical Writings*, 2: 134). See Hume's interpretation of Descartes in n. 16 (and ann. n. 16).

56.5 ***causes* . . . nothing but *occasions*]** In *Letter from a Gentleman* 32 Hume (or his editor, Kames) expressed the following opinions on the problem:

> These Philosophers last-mentioned substituted the Notion of *occasional Causes*, by which it was asserted that a Billiard Ball did not move another by its Impulse, but was only the Occasion why the Deity, in pursuance of general Laws, bestowed Motion on the second Ball. But, tho' this Opinion be very innocent, it never gained great Credit, especially in *England*.

See also *THN* 1.3.14.32 on the 'cause'–'occasion' distinction.

Occasionalists seldom straightforwardly described causes as mere occasions. More commonly, they assumed or implied that this is so in the course of an argument that nothing that is finite has the power to necessitate an effect. All motion is therefore generated by God. See Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 3.2.3, 6.2.3; Elucidation 15; Louis de La Forge, *Traitté de l'esprit de l'homme* 16, especially pp. 246–7, 251–8, 263–4 (1666 edn.); Cordemoy, *Six discours sur la distinction & l'union du corps & de l'ame*, 'Discours 4—De la première cause du mouvement' (*Œuvres*,

136–9, 142–4); and Clauberg, *Metaphysica de ente* 13, 15 (setting forth the principles of cause and action), and *Disputationes physicæ* 18 (on divine causation), in *Opera omnia philosophica*.

56.7 **volition of the Supreme Being**] In occasionalist philosophy, when an event is thought to causally affect another event, an action of God is required; contra Descartes,[B] body and mind do not causally interact. See Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 3.2.6, 6.2.3; Elucidations 1, 15; Clauberg, *Corporis et animæ in homine conjunctionis* 4, 7, 52 (on mind and body), and *Disputationes physicæ* 17 (on movement of the body), in *Opera omnia philosophica*; and Flemish philosopher Arnold Geulincx (1624–69), *Opera philosophica*, 2: 186–90.

56.16 **operation of mind on body**] In *Search after Truth*, Elucidation 15, Malebranche[B] argues that the sole cause is God, who establishes a union between mind and body and operates on the basis of laws of the conjunction of mind and body. See also Clauberg, *Opera omnia philosophica*, *Corporis et animæ in homine conjunctionis* 14, 52, in *Opera omnia philosophica*; Geulincx, *Opera philosophica*, 2: 150–3, 261–5; and the next annotation.

56.26 **second our will**] The theory that the human will is merely the occasion of movement in the body is found in Malebranche[B] (*Search after Truth* 6.2.3); La Forge, *Traitté de l'esprit de l'homme*, 131–4, 196–7, 251–9, 264 (1666 edn.); Cordemoy, *Six discours sur la distinction & l'union du corps & de l'ame*, 'Discours 4—De la première cause du mouvement' (*Œuvres*, 140–3); Clauberg, *Corporis et animæ in homine conjunctionis* 14, and *Theoria corporum viventium* 32, in *Opera omnia philosophica*; Geulincx, *Opera philosophica*, 2: 176–7, 196–7.

57.5 **stupendous machine**] As a possible way of extricating occasionalists (and perhaps other believers in divine providence), Hume here presents the alternative of deism for consideration.

57.17 **analogies and probabilities have any authority**] Hume discusses this problem in *Dialogues* 2, 6–7, 12. The passage may be an allusion to Butler's *Analogy*.

n. 16 **I need not examine**] This footnote substantially overlaps with a passage in *Letter from a Gentleman* 32, which Hume was drafting (later modified by Kames) at approximately the same time that he was drafting the first or 1748 edition of *EHU*. For exact differences, see the collation in the Introduction.

n. 16 ***vis inertiæ***] force of inertia (also force of inactivity). Though Kepler introduced the Latin term, Newton's treatment would more likely have attracted Hume's attention. Departing from Descartes,[B] Newton[B] began to use the term 'inertia' to refer to the internal force of a body (*vis interna corporis*) that resists change. He incorporated the Cartesian conception in definition 3 of the *Mathematical Principles*: 'The vis insita, or innate force of matter, is a power of resisting, by which every body, as much as in it lies, continues in its present state, whether it be of rest, or of moving uniformly forwards in a right line' (*Mathematical Principles*, 2). Newton subsequently reformulated this *vis insita* as *vis inertiae* and made it proportional to the mass of a

body. This reformulation enabled him to use mathematical calculations and made the *vis inertiae* more than merely a force in the explanation of motion. He placed this new account in a broader theory of motion in *Opticks* 3.1 (397):

> The *Vis inertiæ* is a passive Principle by which Bodies persist in their Motion or Rest, receive Motion in proportion to the Force impressing it, and resist as much as they are resisted. By this Principle alone there never could have been any Motion in the World. Some other Principle was necessary for putting Bodies into Motion; and now they are in Motion, some other Principle is necessary for conserving the Motion.

Vis inertiae is discussed in simplified terms in Cheyne, *Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion* 1, especially 1.7 (citing Newton). Clarke[B] criticizes Leibniz[B] for an inadequate understanding of the notion in their correspondence (Clarke, Fifth Reply, in *Works*, 4: 690–1). Scottish philosopher Andrew Baxter (1686–1750), a follower of Clarke and near-neighbour of Hume's (though contact between them is undocumented), published one of the most comprehensive theories of the *vis inertiae* in Hume's day. He defined *vis inertiae* as 'resistance to a change of [matter's] present state of rest or motion' (p. 77) and held that this property is essential to matter. He maintained that material beings (unlike God and human souls) lack active powers and have only the power to resist change. See *An Enquiry into the Nature of the Human Soul*, sect. 1, especially pp. 11, 22–7 (and the note on 27–9). Baxter may be under criticism in n. 16, but, if so, Hume would seem to be reading him as a Cartesian or an occasionalist.

n. 16 **the new philosophy]** The reference is to modern natural philosophy or experimental philosophy, as influenced by developments in many advancing sciences. The new philosophy arose in the work of figures such as Galileo, Bacon,[B] Gassendi, Descartes,[B] Hobbes, Wilkins, Boyle, and Newton.[B] The philosophy was considered 'new' because it replaced prevailing scholastic views and embraced experimental methods. Boyle, a forceful supporter, discusses what are 'called the new philosophers' in the preface to *The Christian Virtuoso*. Bayle[B] links 'the new philosophy' to theories of perception and scepticism in natural philosophy (*Dictionary*, 'Pyrrho' [B]).

n. 16 **acquires itself]** Scientific laws of inertia first arose as scientists began to depart from classical physics, which had construed motion as requiring external agency for both initiation and continuation. Without using the term 'inertia', Galileo formulated the hypothesis that once a body is in motion, it continues in that motion until affected by an external source of resistance. Descartes[B] developed Galileo's hypothesis as the law of inertia; see *Principles of Philosophy* 2.37.

n. 16 **Newton[B] . . . second causes]** Chambers (*Cyclopædia*, 'cause') defines 'second causes' as 'those which derive the power, and faculty of acting, from a first cause. Such Causes don't properly act at all; but are acted on: and therefore are improperly called causes: of which kind are all those that we call natural causes. . . .

[S]econd Cause . . . is acted upon by some superior or first cause, to produce any effect.' See Hume's gloss on 'second causes' in *THN* 1.3.14.11.

Maclaurin presented the following interpretation of Newton.[B]

> Tho' [God] is the source of all efficacy, yet we find that place is left for second causes to act in subordination to him. . . . [Powers] are not to be considered as mere immediate volitions of his (as they are often represented) but rather as instruments made by him, to perform the purposes for which he intended them. If, for example, the most noble phænomena in nature be produced by a rare elastic *ætherial medium*, as Sir *Isaac Newton* conjectured, the whole efficacy of this medium must be resolved into his power and will, who is the supreme cause. . . . (*An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries*, 388–9 (published after *EHU* went to press)).

In the 1750 or second edition of *EHU* Hume formulated his statement of Newton's view in n. 16 so that Newton accepted 'an etherial active Matter' (*EHU*, 1750 edn., 118n.). In 1754 physician and natural philosopher John Stewart (1715?–59) criticized Hume's thesis in a paper discussed in the Introduction to this volume (see 'Reception in the 1750s'). This paper led Hume to change 'matter' to either 'second causes' or 'fluid'. Newton struggled with some of the relevant distinctions in his *Opticks*, and Clarke[B] (see ann. n. 16) pursued issues in his correspondence with Leibniz.[B] On Malebranche,[B] likely another of Hume's sources, see below. This dispute, especially at the hands of Clarke, Maclaurin, and Stewart, had theological implications. For theological problems and metaphysical distinctions preceding and informing the literature on second causes, see Gassendi, *Syntagma*: Physics 1.4.8.

n. 16 **etherial active fluid]** Before the *Mathematical Principles* Newton[B] offered a theory of the ether similar to that of Descartes.[B] He hypothesized mediated action at a distance, but did not advance hypotheses regarding the *nature* of the medium. In the *Mathematical Principles* Newton suspended hypotheses about both the ether and the causal mechanism in gravitation, maintaining that gravitational attraction can be explained in terms of a universal mathematical law that does not presume action at a distance. His strategy led to his famous statement that

> hitherto I have not been able to discover the cause of those properties of gravity from phenomena, and I frame no hypotheses [*hypotheses non fingo*]; for whatever is not deduced from the phenomena is to be called an hypothesis; and hypotheses, whether metaphysical or physical, whether of occult qualities or mechanical, have no place in experimental philosophy. . . . [I]t is enough that gravity does really exist, and act according to the laws which we have explained. (*Mathematical Principles* 3, general scholium (547)).

n. 16 **Des Cartes[B] insinuated . . . Malebranche[B] and other Cartesians]** Descartes's philosophy suggests, without concluding, that God is the moving force of bodies. This moving force is not in the bodies themselves. His recondite views on

divine causation and the dependence of all events on God are not easily situated within the paradigm of the occasionalist model. See *Principles of Philosophy* 1.21; 2.36, 39, 42; *Objections and Replies* 5 (*Philosophical Writings*, 2: 253–5) and 6 (*Philosophical Writings*, 2: 293–4); and 'Letter to Princess Elizabeth' of 6 Oct. 1645 (*Philosophical Writings*, 3: 272). In Malebranche's theory, everything takes place because of the intervention of God; no causes other than God exist in nature. See Malebranche, *Search after Truth* 6.2.3 and Elucidation 15. See the explication of his and other Cartesians' views about the efficacy of the Deity in ann. Section 7.21 ff.

n. 16 **Locke,[B] Clarke,[B] and Cudworth[B]**] English philosophers Locke, Clarke, and Ralph Cudworth discussed philosophical issues about whether matter has force, but none adopted occasionalism. Cudworth was a significant figure in metaphysics, but not in the scientific controversies discussed in this footnote. Clarke was a Newtonian who did not have a supplementary ether theory and left matter wholly passive. These philosophers are mentioned in *Letter from a Gentleman* 32: '*Cudworth*, *Lock[e]* and *Clark* make little or no mention of [occasionalist doctrines of causation]. Sir *Isaac Newton* (tho' some of his Followers have taken a different Turn of thinking) plainly rejects it, by substituting the Hypothesis of an Æthereal Fluid, not the immediate Volition of the Deity, as the Cause of Attraction.'

n. 16 **modern metaphysicians]** The modern metaphysicians are those continental or British writers who (subsequent to the time of Locke[B] and Clarke[B]) embrace occasionalism. Besides the occasionalists, Berkeley[B] is the most prominent modern metaphysician not specifically listed. Though prominent, he never had any 'authority in England', where his views were universally rejected.

59.20 **customary transition]** In his discussion of necessary connection Malebranche[B] anticipated Hume's idea that the mind projects necessity onto objects and events; see ann. n. 17 below ('apply to external bodies' . . .). Other philosophers had commented on the human capacity to project sentiments onto objects in the case of heat, sound, colour, and the like. See the discussion of 'translating . . . our Passions to things without us' in Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica* 12. See also *THN* 1.3.14.24–5.

n. 17 **square of its velocity]** The dispute here mentioned is between Leibniz[B] (and his followers), on the one hand, and the Cartesians and Newtonians, on the other. Leibniz argued that the force (*vis viva*, or living force) of a body in motion is properly measured by the formula mv^2—that is, the product of mass (m) and velocity (v) squared. Cartesians and Newtonians defended the simpler formula mv, the product of mass and velocity, and held that mv is the quantity conserved. These formulae vied for status in mechanics. Eventually it was appreciated that mv^2 described the force of a moving body over a given distance, whereas mv described the force over a given time. Part of the problem in the dispute arose from what the opponents were attempting to measure. Similarly, there was a variation in the experiments used to confirm their hypotheses: Leibniz used examples such as raising weights, whereas Newtonians and Cartesians appealed to colliding bodies.

n. 17 ***nisus* or endeavour]** See ann. n. 13.

n. 17 **apply to external bodies every internal sensation]** Malebranche[B] spoke of the mind's tendency 'to spread itself onto the objects it considers by clothing them with what it has stripped from itself' (*Search after Truth* 1.12.5, 5.6), thereby leading to 'error'. In *THN* 1.3.14.25 Hume discusses the mind's 'great propensity to spread itself on external objects'. Many philosophers held that objects are not themselves coloured, cold, or odorous; rather, such properties are in our minds and projected onto events or objects.

61.21 **readily apprehend this reasoning]** This conclusion about necessary connection prompted Hume to say in *THN* 1.3.14.24 that 'of all the paradoxes, which I have had, or shall hereafter have occasion to advance . . . the present one is the most violent, and that 'tis merely by dint of solid proof and reasoning I can ever hope it will have admission, and overcome the inveterate prejudices of mankind'. See also *Abstract* 32–4.

SECTION 8

OF LIBERTY AND NECESSITY] *THN* 2.3.1–2 treats this subject under the identical heading, 'Of liberty and necessity'. This title is identical to a treatise on the subject by Hobbes.

62.28 **long disputed question]** Hume uses this exact expression and provides a similar analysis in *THN* 2.3.1.1–2. Numerous ancient and medieval writers discussed the problem of liberty. Landmark modern writers include Hobbes, John Bramhall (1594–1663; English prelate in Ireland), Descartes,[B] Spinoza, Leibniz,[B] Locke,[B] Collins, and Clarke.[B] The discussions in Hobbes, Bramhall, and Collins appear to be especially pertinent to Hume's analysis.

62.31 **same opinion]** See ann. 63.13 and 71.9. Compare Locke,[B] *Essay* 3.10.22, 3.11.7: 'they think all the same' and 'Disputes . . . [being] meerly Verbal'.

63.13 **merely upon words]** See ann. n. 18 and the passages from Locke[B] in the previous annotation. Bramhall said that his debates with Hobbes could be interpreted as involving a sense of the term 'necessity' that 'no man ever denied or doubted of', but he thought that, in fact, the disagreement was about the true nature of liberty and necessity (*Defence of True Liberty*, 4 ff.).

63.15 **universally allowed, that matter]** Hume is referring to the mechanistic systems of the Cartesians and Newtonians, which are discussed in ann. n. 16 and n. 17. Brief statements of the system Hume most admired can be found in Newton,[B] preface to the first edition of *Mathematical Principles*, and *Opticks* 3.1. Compare the associated statement at *THN* 2.3.1.3.

64.1 **no notion of any necessity, or connexion]** Compare *THN* 2.3.1.4 and the annotations throughout Section 7 above.

64.12 **same motives always produce the same actions]** Compare the similar themes in *THN* 2.3.1.4, 10–17; 2.3.2.2, 4; 3.2.1.2–11. Hobbes and Collins held comparable views about necessity in human action.

64.19 **Greeks . . . Romans . . . French and English]** Compare Hume's discussions of this subject in 'A Dialogue' appended to *EPM* and 'Of National Characters'.

64.33 **Aristotle[B] . . . Hippocrates[B]]** Aristotle drew on his predecessors while rebuking the early Milesians for relying too heavily on *material* causes, including the basic elements of earth, air, water, fire, and the like (*Metaphysics* 1, 3–5, especially 983[b]7–984[a]11, 986[b]25–987[a]19; *Physics* 187[a]12–188[a]17; see also his account of the four causes, as discussed in ann. 5.21). In the Hippocratic work *Nature of Man* 1, a report appears on air, fire, water, and earth.

64.35 **Polybius[B] and Tacitus[B]]** Polybius and Tacitus are principal classical sources for Hume. Both try to move beyond the narration of particular events to what is general or universal in human history. Both connect motives with actions, sometimes to explain and sometimes to praise or blame. For reflections on historical writing and appeals to human nature, see Polybius, *Histories* 1.1, 4, 14; 4.8; 8.2, 8; 9.22–3; 16.28; Tacitus, *Annals* 3.55, 65; 6.6, 22.

65.6 **Quintus Curtius[B] . . . Alexander[B]]** Quintus Curtius Rufus often discusses the courage of Alexander the Great (4th c. BC). An act of courage so elevated as to seem supernatural is described in *History of Alexander* 9.5, where Alexander is depicted as battling single-handedly and successfully against overwhelming odds.

65.10 **uniformity in human motives and actions]** Bramhall denies this thesis in his debate with Hobbes (*Defence of True Liberty*, 166–9, 206–7), arguing instead that 'Motives determine not naturally but morally' and without necessitation. Bramhall argued that *voluntary* acts require a model based on deliberation rather than movement.

65.40 **uniformity and regularity]** A similar argument is found in Collins, *Human Liberty*, 44 ff. See also *THN* 2.3.1.11.

66.2 **custom and education]** See ann. 113.1.

66.25 **vulgar . . . first appearance]** On the 'vulgar', see also *EHU* 7.21, 9.5, 10.21, 10.34. In *THN* 1.3.12.5–6 and 1.4.2.36 (and elsewhere) Hume portrays the vulgar as unphilosophical and unreflective persons who judge by first appearances, but he notes that we all fall into this class in some judgements.

66.30 **hid, by reason of their minuteness]** This thesis, using the language of 'minuteness', is found in Collins, *Human Liberty*, 48–9. See also Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.3.24–9.

67.1 **connexion between all causes and effects is equally necessary]** See the nearly identical treatment in *THN* 1.3.12.5. See also *THN* 1.3.12.25, 2.3.1.12–16; *Abstract* 32.

67.5 **medicines operate not with their wonted powers]** See Hume's examples at 6.4 of rhubarb as an inconsistent purge and opium as an inconsistent narcotic.

67.9 **animal œconomy]** 'Œconomy' is the organization or internal constitution of the major subdivisions in nature. Most books on animal economy available in the 18th century were on the human economy. Chambers defined *Animal Œconomy* as 'the first branch of the theory of medicine; or that which explains the parts of the human body, their structure and use; the nature and causes of life and health, and the effects or phænomena arising from them' (*Cyclopædia*, 'oeconomy'). See assorted essays by Scottish physician and anatomist James Keill (1673–1719) and by James Jurin, in Keill, *Essays on Several Parts of the Animal Oeconomy*.

67.16 **same reasoning]** Compare *THN* 2.3.1.2: 'same maxims'.

68.34 ***politics* be a science]** See Hume's essay 'That Politics may be Reduced to a Science'.

69.5 ***natural* and *moral* evidence]** Natural evidence is based on the constant conjunction of objects or events in nature. Moral evidence is based on the constant conjunction of motives and acts. (See, further, ann. 84.10.) Inferences are made from each type of evidence to support factual claims; evidence in each case rests on constant conjunctions. Hume provides a nearly identical passage in *THN* 2.3.1.17; cf. also 2.3.1.15–16. Hume's use of the natural–moral distinction contrasts with that of Bramhall noted in ann. 65.10.

69.14 **wheel]** circular instrument of torture on which a person is stretched until disjointed. According to English traveller Thomas Coryate (*c.*1577–1617), 'wheeling' was used only for murderers (*Coryats Crudities*, 388).

69.21 ***physical* necessity]** On the distinction between physical and moral necessity, see *THN* 1.3.14.33, 2.3.1.17; see also the explication in Anthony Collins, *Human Liberty*, pp. iii, 110–12; and Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'necessity'. Unlike Collins, Bramhall, and others, Hume appears to find the distinction between physical and moral necessity to be without adequate grounds. This distinction derives from the Scholastics and has been explicated in several ways. A *physical necessity* is present when a person lacks all power to act (because of a physical impotence) or power to prevent something from occurring. A *moral necessity* is present when a person is either determined by reason, the senses, or desire; in some usages, the agent has the power to act, but a great difficulty (such as habituation or a strong desire) stands in the way of the person's ability to act or to prevent something from occurring. It was generally agreed that physical necessity precludes liberty, but it was controversial whether a person governed only by moral necessity is free.

69.40 **Charing Cross]** Charing Cross, a heavily travelled area of London, is sometimes described as the centre of the city because distances from London are commonly measured from this location (as Locke^{B} assumes, *Essay* 2.26.5). Edward I (1239–1307) erected a cross on this site in 1290 after the death of his queen. The

cross was razed in 1647 and the present equestrian statue featuring Charles I was erected in 1676.

70.9 **profess the contrary opinion]** Compare *THN* 2.3.2.1–5 for an explanation of 'the prevalence of the doctrine of liberty'—of, that is, an alleged liberty of indifference consistent with necessity.

70.29 **systems of many philosophers]** Collins discusses this thesis and various philosophers whose systems contradict it in *Human Liberty*, 36–40, 50–2, 74–5. Collins often mentions Epicureans. Prominent figures known to Hume who professed a liberty-based view that denied necessity (whether or not in Hume's sense) included King, *Essay on the Origin of Evil* 5.1 (especially 5.1.3.16–19); and Bramhall, *Defence of True Liberty*, 11, 13, 228 ff. Both insist that the will is a true and undetermined cause.

70.30 **determinations of the will]** Hume here brings the will into the analysis of liberty (compare also *EHU* 7.26 and 8.23–7 for prior references to the will). In *THN* 2.3 ('Of the will and direct passions', in which Hume's section 'Of liberty and necessity' appears), the will plays a major role; see 2.3.1.2 for a description of the will as an impression rather than as a faculty.

n. 18 **prevalence of the doctrine of liberty]** This identical expression occurs at *THN* 2.3.2.1, with reasons listed for the prevalence.

n. 18 **liberty or indifference]** Compare the use of these notions in *THN* 2.3.1.3, 2.3.2.1–2; and *Abstract* 31. See Watts's explanation of the 'liberty of indifference' as the 'power to choose or refuse, to choose one thing or another among several things which are proposed, without any inward or outward restraint, force, or constraining bias or influence'. (See similarly Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'liberty'.) Watts declared this freedom 'inconsistent with all necessity' as well as with all doctrines of internal causal determination of the will ('An Essay on the Freedom of the Will in God and in Creatures' 1.4–5, in *Works*, vol. 6). For a view resembling Hume's, see Collins, *Discourse*, pp. 18–19, 67–75.

n. 18 ***Velleïty***] A velleïty is a pure wishing, desiring, or inclination unaccompanied by any attempt to obtain what is fancied. In other words, a mental act occurs without a corresponding act of implementation. Velleïty is to be contrasted with both resolve and volition. For 17th- and 18th-century usage of the term, see Cheyne on the innate power of the will in *An Essay on Regimen* (315), Abraham Tucker's contrast between volition and velleïty in *The Light of Nature Pursued* 1 (28–9); Hobbes on the 'new word' 'velleity' (*Human Nature* 9.1); and Locke's treatment of 'bare Velleity' as the lowest degree of desire, which carries one no further than a 'faint wish' for something (*Essay* 2.20.6).

71.9 **dispute . . . merely verbal]** See ann. 63.13 ('**merely upon words**'). On disputes as merely verbal, see *EPM* n. 64; Appx. 4.1 and Appx. 4.2; *NHR* 7.1; *THN* 1.4.6.21, 3.3.4.1; *Dialogues* 12.8. Hume is perhaps influenced by Locke:[B] 'The

greatest part of the Disputes in the World', he says, may be 'meerly Verbal' (*Essay* 3.11.7). See also Watts's suggestion that much in this controversy involves 'disputes about words' ('An Essay on the Freedom of Will in God and in Creatures' 1.5 (*Works*, 6: 244–5)).

72.11 **By *liberty*]** Compare *THN* 2.3.1.18. See the similar account in Hobbes, *Leviathan* 21.1–4; and *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance* 4 (*Works*, 5: 56–65), 16 (ibid. 5: 224–8)—as well as the critique in Bramhall, *Defence of True Liberty*, 210–11, 226–7. See also the predecessor accounts in Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.21.8, 21; Collins, *Human Liberty*, pp. ii, 11, 14–18; and Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'freedom' and 'liberty'.

72.22 ***chance* . . . a mere negative word]** See ann. 6.1 above; see also *THN* 2.3.1.18.

73.7 **dangerous consequences to religion]** See *THN* 2.3.2.3. It was standard fare in the 17th and 18th centuries to denounce philosophers because of the presumed dangerousness of their systems to religion and morality. See, for example, German philosopher and political writer Samuel von Pufendorf (1632–94), *Law of Nature* 3.4.4. Those taken to be atheists—Hobbes, for example—were common targets. See Bramhall's reservations centred on the necessitarians' apparent elimination of categories such as praise, blame, punishment, and sin (*Defence of True Liberty*, 14–15, 60–1, 76–9); and Hobbes's reaction in *An Answer to Dr. Bramhall*, Epistle to the Reader (*Works*, 4: 282). Hume was apparently accused of holding dangerous views in an essay by Edinburgh University principal William Wishart (1692–1753) that motivated the writing of *A Letter from a Gentleman* (see pars. 19, 36 ff. in this work and the Introduction to this volume).

73.17 **defined two ways . . . two definitions of *cause*]** The reference is to the two definitions of 'cause' presented at *EHU* 7.29. Hume appeals to these two definitions to support two definitions of 'necessity' in *THN* 2.3.2.4.

74.4 **received orthodox system]** The reference is to traditional views that the will is itself free of prior causal determination and that human choices create new causal chains. See Descartes,[B] *Principles of Philosophy* 1.39–42 (1: 205–6); Watts, 'Whether Liberty Can Be Ascribed to the Will?' and 'An Essay on the Freedom of Will in God and in Creatures' 2–3 (*Works*, 5: 620; 6: 247 ff.); and Bramhall and King, as discussed at ann. 70.29. Interpretation of some of these philosophers as 'orthodox' in the relevant sense has been challenged; for example, the texts of Descartes (for whom the will acts freely) have yielded strikingly different interpretations.

74.7 **laws being founded on rewards and punishments]** Compare similar ideas in Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.28.6; and Collins, *Human Liberty*, 91–9.

74.30 **Men are not blamed]** Compare the longer, but almost identical, passage in *THN* 2.3.2.7.

75.20 **no indifference; no liberty]** For such objections, see Cheyne, *Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion* 2.13; and Watts, 'An Essay on the Freedom of the Will in God and in Creatures' 1.4 (*Works*, vol. 6).

75.30 **author of all the rest]** The account of a chain of necessary causes may be premissed on an interpretation of Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 2.1.4.3; 6.2.3, 9; Elucidation 15. With some reconstruction, the view could be attributed to Cordemoy, *Six discours sur la distinction & l'union du corps & de l'ame*, 'Discours 4—De la première cause du mouvement' (*Œuvres*, 136, 139, 142–4). See also *EHU* 8.36; *THN* 1.4.5.31 (with a footnote reference to 'Malebranche and other Cartesians'); and the related ideas about the volitions of a deity in *Dialogues* 11, especially 11.7 ff.

76.16 **many philosophers . . . perfect benevolence]** This is possibly another reference to Leibniz[B] (and, according to Hume, King; see ann. 44.29) on the best of all possible worlds. However, it is more likely a reference to the figures noted immediately below (under 'ancient Stoics').

76.24 **some philosophers, and the ancient Stoics]** Several modern philosophers embraced such Stoic attitudes, among them Flemish classicist Justus Lipsius (1547–1606); see *De constantia* or *Of Constancie* 1.13–15, 18–20. The expression 'constancy on his mind' later in this paragraph could be an allusion to Lipsius, whom Hume mentions elsewhere. Although ancient Stoics and other philosophers cannot here be identified with confidence, Seneca's theory and language in 'De providentia' 3.1 and 5.7–8 (in *Moral Essays*) resemble Hume's formulation to a striking degree. See also Marcus Aurelius,[B] *Meditations* 10.5–6.

76.32 **humours]** A humour is a fluid or semi-fluid substance in the body. According to ancient teachings, four humours (blood, yellow bile, black bile, and phlegm) govern the body and determine its characteristics. The earliest of the ancient writings may have been Hippocratic; one source for the humoral theory is *The Nature of Man*, a work mentioned in ann. 64.33.

77.31 **Deity . . . author of sin]** This is a recurrent topic in Hobbes, *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance* 11–12, 15. The issue is also raised in a cryptic manner in Berkeley,[B] *Dialogues* 3.

77.33 **These are mysteries]** Compare *NHR* 11.3, 15.13. This concluding paragraph could be a bridge to Hume's discussion in Section 11 of the limits of theology and philosophy.

SECTION 9

REASON OF ANIMALS] Hume discusses reason and the passions in animals—and their connection to human nature—in three sections of *THN*: 1.3.16 ('Of the reason of animals'); 2.1.12 ('Of the pride and humility of animals'); 2.2.12 ('Of the love and hatred of animals'); and in his essays 'Of the Dignity or Meanness of Human Nature' 5–6 and 'Of the Immortality of the Soul' 7. The latter includes a concise statement of part of the account found here.

Some of the issues that Hume treats in this section are ancient, dating at least from the Pythagoreans. The most extensive and imposing account was that of the

Neoplatonist philosopher Porphyry (3rd–4th c. AD), *On Abstinence from Animal Food*, especially bk. 3, though perhaps the most revolutionary was Plutarch's 'Whether Land or Sea Animals are Cleverer' and 'Beasts are Rational' (*Moralia* 959A–992E). Particularly influential were both Aristotle's thesis that humans alone have intellect or reason, though some other animals are intelligent (see *Parts of Animals* 641^{b}7–20; *On the Soul* 414^{a}29–415^{a}12, 427^{b}28–428^{b}3, 432^{a}15–434^{b}12; *Politics* 1332^{b}4–5; *Nicomachean Ethics* 1098^{a}2–7; *Metaphysics* 980^{b}1–981^{a}1), and the Stoic denial of significant language, reason, virtue, and even real emotion to animals—see, for example, Seneca, *On Anger* (*De ira*) 1.3.4–8, in *Moral Essays*, and *Epistles* 113.18–20, 124.1; and Cicero,[B] *De finibus* 3.67 (on Chrysippus). (The topic of reason in animals can also be linked to Sextus Empiricus; see below.)

Hume nowhere mentions specific sources of his information about animals. Because modern writings appear to be most closely connected to Hume's theses, modern rather than classical writers are emphasized below. Bayle[B] (*Dictionary*, 'Rorarius' [F–L]; 'Barbara' [C]; 'Pereira' [C–I]) cites many authors, ancient and modern, who discuss whether animals have souls, and a few who discuss reason in animals.

79.1 **species of** ANALOGY**]** Hume uses analogies between human and non-human animals throughout this section. In 'Of the Immortality of the Soul' 37, he writes: 'The souls of animals are allowed to be mortal; and these bear so near a resemblance to the souls of men, that the analogy from one to the other forms a very strong argument. Their bodies are not more resembling; yet no one rejects the arguments drawn from comparative anatomy.' See further Hume's discussion of applying 'rules of analogy' to animal species at *THN* 2.1.12.6; *EPM* Appx. 2.8; and *EHU* 9.5.

79.6 **cohesion of parts]** cohesion of the parts of matter. See ann. 26.5 and 27.38.

79.13 **as a frog, or fish]** English physician William Harvey (1578–1657) used the frog and fish in his presentation of the way the blood circulates in animal and human bodies (*An Anatomical Disquisition on the Motion of the Heart and Blood in Animals* 2–6, 10, 17). Harvey proved by dissection and vivisection that blood is impelled in a pumplike motion, arguing for what Hume here calls 'a strong presumption, that the same principle has place' in all anatomically similar animals. Hume uses the identical example and appeals to analogy in *Dialogues* 2.7. See also James Keill's work on circulation and the body of human and non-human animal as a 'pure machine', in *Essays on Several Parts of the Animal Oeconomy* 1–3 (and preface).

79.14 **analogical observations may be carried farther]** How far such analogies may be carried reaches back at least to Sextus Empiricus, who discusses pitfalls in using such analogies in *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.40–4, 50, 55, 59–61. Montaigne used analogies to indicate fundamental similarities between humans and beasts in 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 512–27, 531–9). His analogies expressing a concordance between animals and humans were criticized by

Descartes[B] (*Discourse on Method* 5; Letters to the Marquess of Newcastle, 23 Nov. 1646 and to More, 5 Feb. 1649) and Malebranche[B] (*Search after Truth* 2.3.5, 4.11.3, 5.3, 6.2.7; Elucidation 15). Gassendi carried analogical observations further (in Hume's sense) in *Exercises Against the Aristotelians* 2.5.4, 2.6.2 (also preface) and *Rebuttals Against Descartes* 2.7.2.

Bayle[B] argued that ancient writers, as well as Locke,[B] Thomas Willis, Ignace-Gaston Pardies, and other moderns, had defended the position that some animals have capacities of reason (*Dictionary*, 'Rorarius' [D], [F], [G]; 'Pereira' [H], [I]). Locke used analogy and endorsed limited reason in animals (*Essay* 4.16.12), but he judged that animals lack powers of abstraction (*Essay* 2.11.5–11). Pardies regularly engaged in analogy in *Discours de la connoissance des bestes*. He accepted reason in animals, but argued that they lack the ability consciously to reflect on their understanding (*Discours de la connoissance des bestes*, especially 137, 147, 167, 175, 191–3, 214).

Bayle and La Mettrie both rely on Willis, *Two Discourses concerning the Soul of Brutes* 1, 6–7. (La Mettrie also cites Willis's *Cerebri anatome*.) La Mettrie often uses the language of 'analogy' to express views similar to those that Hume discusses; see *Machine Man*, 10–11, 35–7. Willis used physiology and noted that his theory about 'reasoning and understanding' in the brutes was developed 'analogically'. He maintained that some brutes 'form certain Propositions' and 'draw certain Conclusions' (*Two Discourses concerning the Soul of Brutes* 6–7 (pp. 34–43; see also preface and ch. 1).

Many analogical observations are found in Voltaire,[B] but in works either written or published after *EHU*.

79.15 **science . . . understanding . . . passions]** The theory mentioned is Hume's own account of human nature. *EHU* is on the 'operations of the understanding'. *A Dissertation on the Passions* is on 'the passions in man'. *THN* 1–2 covers the two topics in this order. Hume contemplates, in the present passage, a possible analogical extension of the theory to explain similar phenomena in animals—presumably doing for the mind what Harvey and other physiologists had done for the body.

79.29 **cunning and sagacity]** Compare similar observations about animals in Plutarch,[B] 'Whether Land or Sea Animals are Cleverer', especially 10 ff. (966B ff.); Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Rorarius' [F]; Montaigne, 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 512–27, 531–5); Willis, *Two Discourses concerning the Soul of Brutes* 6–7 (especially pp. 37, 39); Collins, *Human Liberty*, 54–6. Kenelme Digby offers a materialistic explanation of cunning and sagacity in *Treatises*, First Treatise 36–8. Semi-popular works also included discussions of the cunning, sagacity, reason, courage, etc. of animals. Examples of both the animals and the actions that Hume discusses are found in Edward Topsel's popular 1658 collection *The History of Four-footed Beasts and Serpents* (see e.g. 111–17 (dogs), 242–5 (horses)).

80.2 **doubles]** sharp backward and forward turns of reversal of direction in running—for example, those of a hunted hare when doubling back. Reasons for the

phenomenon (and its abandonment when dogs get near the hare) are discussed in Digby, *Treatises*, First Treatise 36, p. 387.

80.7 **contrary to their natural instincts and propensities]** Related topics about discipline and education are treated in Montaigne, 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 518–19); Digby, *Treatises*, First Treatise 37; and La Mettrie, *Machine Man*, 10–13, 35.

80.25 **not guided . . . by reasoning]** A popular view dating from ancient philosophy was that animals are conscious and have capacities of instinct, perception, memory, emotion, imagination, and even intellect—but lack true rationality. See Sorabji, *Animal Minds and Human Morals* for a comprehensive treatment of ancient philosophy. See also Bayle,[B] *Dictionary* ('Rorarius' and 'Pereira'), the passages in Leibniz[B] cited below, and the treatment of ideas and learning in birds in Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.10.10.

80.37 **custom alone, which engages animals]** See also ann. n. 20. Theses similar to Hume's are found in Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.11.10–11. The intellectual background of such theories is rich. Willis used an account of *natural instinct* and *knowledge* to frame a theory of the mental life and actions of animals, in *Two Discourses concerning the Soul of Brutes* 6 (especially p. 37). Leibniz[B] offered a theory of mental expectation, causal inference, habit, learning by experience, and reasoning in animals that resembles Hume's, though Leibniz denies that animals have a knowledge of causes (*Monadology* 25–30; *New Essays* (pub. 1765) 2.11.11, 2.33.18, 3.11, 4.16–17; *Principles of Nature and Grace* 5). Leibniz does, however, suggest a weak analogy to thought in animals based on connections made in the memory and imagination. Bayle[B] replies to distantly connected theses of Leibniz about the souls of beasts and humans in *Dictionary*, 'Rorarius' [H] and [L].

81.7 **denominate *instincts*]** See ann. 39.20, 80.7, and 81.12 on instinct. Willis treated 'natural instinct' as the source of innate knowledge in animals, in *Two Discourses concerning the Soul of Brutes* 6 (p. 34). See also Porphyry, *On Abstinence from Animal Food* 3.6–7 and Plutarch,[B] 'Beasts are Rational' (*Moralia*, especially 989B ff.).

81.11 **in common with beasts]** Porphyry (*On Abstinence from Animal Food* 3) and Montaigne ('Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12; Screech, 502–19) attempted to reduce and in some respects even eliminate alleged differences in language, reasoning, and the like between humans and beasts. See also Willis, as mentioned in the annotations immediately above. Gassendi (cited by Willis) also hypothesized that we share forms of reason and reasoning with the beasts, remarking that he had laboured to 'restore reason to animals' (*Exercises Against the Aristotelians*, preface, 2.5.4, 2.6.2; and *The Rebuttals Against Descartes* 7.2). See also Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.16.12; and cf. 3.6.27, 4.18.11; and the nuanced comparisons of similarities and differences between human and non-human animals in Pufendorf, *Law of Nature* 2.3.2–3.

81.12 **nothing but a species of instinct]** This thesis had predecessors in Leibniz,[B] *Monadology* 28, and Descartes,[B] 'Letter to Mersenne', 16 Oct. 1639

(*Philosophical Writings*, 3: 140), both of whom dealt with the mind's natural intellectual instinct and instinct for truth. The discussion both before and after Descartes often focused on the question whether beasts are mere machines that lack souls, powers of reason, and the like. See Porphyry, *On Abstinence from Animal Food* 3.10, 25; Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Rorarius'. See also ann. 39.20, 80.7, and 81.7 on instinct and *THN* 1.3.16.9 and 2.2.12.5 on the instincts of animals compared to humans.

81.12 **mechanical power]** Compare *THN* 1.3.16.9: 'reason is nothing but a wonderful and unintelligible instinct.' La Mettrie argued that intelligence, the capacity to learn, and the like were entirely mechanical. He thought that Descartes[B] made a mistake not by denying that animals have a non-material soul, but in attributing such a soul to humans. See *Machine Man*, 11–13, 34–5, 52.

82.3 **œconomy . . . of its nursery]** organization and management of the bird's dwelling, in which growth and flourishing occur. English philosopher Henry More (1614–87), in *An Antidote against Atheism* 2.9.9, used this example in the context of an elaborate discussion of the nature of animals and their place in the divine creation. Hume uses a similar example of the bird at *THN* 1.3.16.5.

SECTION 10

83.1 **Tillotson's writings]** Tillotson[B] inveighed against atheism and Roman Catholicism. Many arguments against transubstantiation are to be found in 'A Discourse against Transubstantiation' (*Works*, sermon 26). However, the argument that Hume attributes to Tillotson most closely approximates that found in a sermon, 'The Hazard of being Sav'd in the Church of *Rome*' (*Works*, sermon 11). Tillotson briefly discusses transubstantiation in other sermons, especially 'Of the Tryal of the Spirits' (*Works*, sermon 21). In *Letter from a Gentleman* 23 Hume favourably cites Tillotson's sermon 'The Wisdom of Being Religious' (*Works*, sermon 1) for its attention to the 'Species of Evidence' appropriate to theological argument. Like Hume, Tillotson relies on the distinction between experience and testimony, giving priority to experience.

83.1 *real presence*] The term 'real presence' refers to that into which the substance of the bread and wine of the sacrament of Holy Communion is allegedly transformed. Their accidental properties do not change, but their substance does. In his *History of England* Hume several times discusses the historical importance of this doctrine; in *NHR* 12.3 he criticizes the doctrine. Catholic theologian and philosopher St Thomas Aquinas (13th c. AD) (*Summa theologiae* 3a.75) and several Councils (Fourth Lateran Council, 1215; Council of Constance, 1415–16; Council of Florence, 1439; Council of Trent, 1562) published influential accounts, which agree that the whole substance of bread and the whole substance of wine are converted by divine power into the whole substance of the body and blood of Christ—so that the presence is real, not symbolic or metaphorical. Being imperceptible to the senses and not involving an alteration in accidental properties, transubstantiation is not a

miracle, but a *mystery* known by faith. Tillotson[B] and Hume have been criticized by some scholars for failing to appreciate the true nature of the Roman Catholic position. (See the annotation immediately below.) However, the Catholic position was sometimes represented by Catholic philosophers in a manner that invited the view that Hume and Tillotson take. See the influential representation in Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, ch. 15, and second part, ch. 12 (Buroker, 71–2, 111–13); see also the reply to Arnauld by Descartes,[B] *Objections and Replies* 4 (*Philosophical Writings*, 2: 153, 172–7).

83.15 **contradicts sense]** As Tillotson[B] notes ('A Discourse against Transubstantiation' (*Works*, sermon 26)), Roman Catholics have traditionally held that a miracle must be an observed phenomenon that serves as a visible sign; it is an extraordinary event produced by God and perceptible to the senses. Tillotson notes that transubstantiation cannot be a miracle, because miracles must by definition be evident to sense, and transubstantiation denies what the senses teach. As the annotation immediately above indicates, there is no direct conflict between this argument and Roman Catholic teachings, and there is no clear violation of a law of nature. Tillotson did not confine his arguments to this point. He also attacked the real presence by maintaining that the doctrine of conversion in substance is not a teaching of Christ, has no authority from the Apostles, was not received by the early Church Fathers, and has not descended by uninterrupted tradition. Acceptance of the doctrine, he held, requires demonstrated premisses that one body can coexist in the same place as another, that a subject may be without quantity, that sensory experience is unreliable, and other metaphysical propositions that he considered unacceptable.

84.10 **moral evidence . . . proportions his belief to the evidence]** In *THN* 2.3.1.15 Hume says that moral evidence is 'nothing but a conclusion concerning the actions of men, deriv'd from the consideration of their motives, temper and situation'. (See ann. 69.5.) Moral evidence is thus to be contrasted with physical and mathematical evidence; cf. *EHU* 8.19 and Hume's example of the gaoler and prisoner.

A related notion in some writers of the period is 'moral certainty' (in which evidence does not warrant reasonable doubt), as is presupposed in *A Letter from a Gentleman* 26–7:

> It is common for Philosophers to distinguish the Kinds of Evidence into *intuitive, demonstrative, sensible*, and *moral*; by which they intend *only* to mark a Difference betwixt them, not to denote a Superiority of one above another. *Moral Certainty* may reach as *high* a Degree of Assurance as *Mathematical*; and our Senses are surely to be comprised amongst the clearest and most convincing of all Evidences.

For various uses of these notions, see Berkeley,[B] *Alciphron*, dials. 6–7; Butler, *Analogy*, introduction; Descartes,[B] *Discourse* 4 and *Principles* 206; Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, ch. 13 (Buroker, 264); Leibniz,[B] *New Essays* (pub. 1765), preface and 4.10; Wilkins, *Principles and Duties of Natural*

Religion 1.1.1–3, 1.3.1–5; British writer and divine William Chillingworth (1602–43), *The Religion of Protestants*, answer 1.8; and Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'evidence'. See also *THN* 2.3.1.15–17, 2.3.2.8; *Abstract* 33; *EHU* 8.19, 12.21; s' Gravesande, *Mathematical Elements of Natural Philosophy*, 'An Oration concerning Evidence', 1: xxxvi–liii; and Beattie (in commenting on *EHU* 4), *Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth* 1.2.6.

84.20 **degree of evidence]** See ann. n. 10 and *THN* 1.3.6.4 and 1.3.11.2 on knowledge, probability, and degrees of evidence. Locke[B] argued that testimony in support of miracles constituted an exception to the general rule that degree of probability and evidence diminishes as the distance from eyewitnesses increases. See *Essay* 4.15–16 (especially 4.16.9–14), which contains a searching examination of testimony and the conditions of belief in it.

84.31 **eye-witnesses and spectators]** This exact language is used in a more general discussion of the historical acceptability of testimony in *THN* 1.3.4.2.

85.9 **witnesses and human testimony]** It was widely believed at the time Hume wrote that belief in miracles could be tested by assessing historical evidence in light of the quantity of witnesses and the quality of their testimony. See Dutch philosopher and legal writer Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), *Truth of the Christian Religion* 2.6, 3.7; English bishop Thomas Sherlock (1678–1761), *The Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus*; British moral philosopher and theologian Peter Annet (1693–1769; pseud. Philalethes), *The Resurrection of Jesus Considered; in Answer to the Tryal of the Witnesses*; and John Jackson (1686–1763), rector of Rossington, *An Address to Deists*.

85.11 ***proof* or a *probability*]** See n. 10 to Section 6 on probability and the annotation on this note.

85.23 **force of its antagonist]** In *Theologiæ Christianæ Principia Mathematica* (1699), British mathematician John Craig (d. 1731), in an effort to defend Christian beliefs, attempted to compute the probability of reliable historical testimony and tradition, arguing that testimony becomes progressively less reliable over time. He treated contradictory reports and what Hume here calls the 'number of circumstances to be taken into consideration'. Craig's eccentric use of probability was sufficiently influential that his 1699 work was republished in 1755. Similar appeals emerged almost simultaneously with the 1699 edition. See the anonymous 'A Calculation of the Credibility of Human Testimony', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 21 (1699), 359–65. Montmort and others expressed reservations about these attempts to use a calculus of probabilities to reinforce the faith.

85.24 **contrariety of evidence]** Some of these causes of contrary evidence—and other parallels to Hume's theses in 10.7—are found in English free-thinker Thomas Woolston (1670–1733), the Third and Fifth of *Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour* (a 1729 edn. is in the Hume Library). Compare also Wollaston, *Religion of Nature Delineated* 3.16 (55–9).

85.35 **extraordinary and the marvellous]** In his *History of England* (2: 398–404) Hume distinguishes the miraculous, the marvellous, and the extraordinary and discusses what circumspect historians allow as evidence: although historians reject claims of the miraculous and doubt the marvellous, they can accept extraordinary reports whenever solid testimony and known facts and circumstances constitute adequate support.

85.38 **credit in witnesses and historians]** French author Robert Challe (1659–1720) used comparable arguments about the reliability and unreliability of forms of testimony about miracles in *Difficultés sur la religion*, 84–5. This work was written before 1712, though not published until 1767 (under the title *Le Militaire philosophe*, authorship disputed; see Deloffre, *Autour de Robert Challe*, 275). It is not known whether Hume knew the manuscript, though it circulated among French intellectuals prior to Hume's work on *EHU*. Related theses about the strength and credit of testimony are found in Boyle, *The Christian Virtuoso* (*Works*, 5: 529–33). However, unlike Challe and Hume, Boyle is contrasting human testimony and divine testimony, while defending Christian belief.

n. 21 **Catonis]** Footnote reference: Plutarch,[B] *Lives*, 'Cato the Younger' 19.4, 768B–C. Plutarch depicts Cato[B] the Younger as a person of virtue and high repute. According to Plutarch, many people, 'when speaking of matters that were strange and incredible, would say, as though using a proverb, "This is not to be believed even though Cato says it" '. Hume discusses 'the virtue and good intentions of Cato' in his essay 'That Politics may be reduced to a Science' 19. A similar theme is found in *EPM* ('A Dialogue' 40), in a discussion of Labeo and Cato. (Note: At n. 9 above the quoted passage refers to Cato the Elder.)

86.14 **Indian prince]** A version of this tale appears in Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.15.5, where a Dutch ambassador tells the king of Siam about frozen water possessing the strength to bear the weight of an elephant. In the introduction to his *Analogy* Butler provides a brief account of this story, attributing it to Locke. Hume's version is closer to Butler's restatement than to Locke's report, but only Hume makes India the location. Locke tells another story about an Indian philosopher involving reference to elephants in *Essay* 2.13.19, 2.23.2. Hume may have inadvertently combined facts of Locke's two different stories. A brief version of the example is also found in Sherlock, *The Trial of the Witnesses*, 62–3, 66, and then repeated in Annet, *The Resurrection of Jesus Considered; in Answer to the Tryal of the Witnesses*, 73. For another variant of the anecdote, see Challe, *Difficultés sur la religion*, 221, which gives the example of the effect of snow on 'the savages of Mexico'.

The example of the Indian prince was added in the second edition of *EHU* (1750). Philip Skelton (1707–87) mentioned the example of frozen water (though the location and other features in his story are different) in *Ophiomaches: or, Deism Revealed*, which was published just prior to Hume's revised manuscript for the second edition. Dialogue 5 of this work (2: 23–4) discusses the first edition of *EHU*.

In the commentary regarding Hume on miracles discussed in the Introduction to

this volume, the Indian prince is the most widely discussed of Hume's several examples of extraordinary events.

n. 22 **Muscovy]** the region of Moscow, possibly extended here to include all of Russia.

86.26 **violation of the laws of nature]** Cf. Hume's additional definition of 'miracle' in n. 23. For discussions of the nature of miracles and the word 'miracle' that may inform Hume's definition, see Hobbes, *Leviathan* 37.1–9; Locke,[B] *A Discourse of Miracles* (*Works*, 9: 256–7, 264); Woolston, *Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour*, Third Discourse, 53; Butler, *Analogy* 2.2.2–4; Clarke,[B] *Discourse* (*Works*, 2: 697–702); Tillotson,[B] 'A Discourse against Transubstantiation' (*Works*, sermon 26); Boyle, *Reconcileableness of Reason and Religion* (*Works*, 4: 162–3); Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Spinoza' [R].

The definition of miracle had been debated for centuries. Roman Catholic philosophers St Augustine (4th–5th c. AD) and St Thomas Aquinas denied that miracles are violations of laws of nature, although they acknowledged that miracles violate the ordinary course of nature as humans experience it. See Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis* 6.13–14, 18; 9.17–18 and *City of God* 21.8; St Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1a. 110, 4 (Blackfriars, 15: 15–17) and *Summa contra gentiles* 3.2.99–102. See, similarly, Jackson, *An Address to Deists*, 14–21.

87.13 ***proof* . . . against . . . miracle]** Hume wrote to Blair (*Letters*, 1: 350) about his meaning: 'The proof against a miracle, as it is founded on invariable experience, is of that *species* of *kind* of proof, which is full and certain when taken alone, because it implies no doubt, as is the case with all probabilities; but there are degrees of this species, and when a weaker proof is opposed to a stronger, it is overcome.' Hume's thesis had been expressed in similar ways in Wollaston, *Religion of Nature Delineated* 3.16 (55–9); and Annet, *The Resurrection of Jesus Considered; in Answer to the Tryal of the Witnesses*, 75–8.

87.15 **miracle rendered credible]** Criticisms of the reasonableness and credibility of various reports of miracles had appeared in Woolston, *Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour*; the *Examen critique* (esp. 189–91), of French secretary of the Académie des Belles-Lettres Nicolas Fréret (1688–1749), and *An Introductory Discourse to a Larger Work . . . concerning the Miraculous Powers* by English controversialist and clergyman Conyers Middleton (1683–1750). Prominent accounts of credible testimony for miracles appeared in Edward Stillingfleet, *Origines sacræ* 2.3, 6, 9–10; Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, ch. 14; Wilkins, *The Principles and Duties of Natural Religion* 1.1.3, 1.7.2; and Charles Wolseley, *The Reasonableness of Scripture-Belief*, 48, 83–4, 241–63. Hume may be countering arguments in Butler, *Analogy* 2.2–4 and Berkeley,[B] *Alciphron* 6.30–2.

n. 23 **miracle may be accurately defined]** See ann. 86.26 above.

87.17 **maxim worthy of our attention]** Hume's position seems opposed to that of Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, chs. 7, 13–14

(Buroker, 251, 262–9). Using the language of 'axioms' and 'maxims', they give priority to the testimony of good persons by comparison to reasons given by others against this testimony. They also formulate the issue about miracles as one of how to weigh apparently reliable human testimony in favour of miracles against the improbability of the miracle's occurrence.

89.7 **religionist may be an enthusiast]** The proposals here resemble theses in Fréret, *Examen critique* 2–3 (especially 1: 41–5). Butler develops this argument and responds to it in *Analogy* 2.7.1.3.

89.17 **credulity]** In *THN* 1.3.9.12–15 Hume defines 'credulity' as 'a too easy faith in the testimony of others'.

89.19 **Eloquence]** See ann. 5.9 above. The art of oratory was widely discussed in the 18th century, as various of Hume's allusions to Demosthenes[B] indicate (see immediately below). Eloquence was regarded as a constructive way to guide a community by moving the passions. See Hume's essay, 'Of Eloquence', and his comment at *DIS* 6.16.

89.22 **Tully . . . Demosthenes[B]]** Cicero[B] made his reputation as a prosecutor and consul. Demosthenes was praised for his lucidity and honesty. Hume compares and discusses the oratory of both figures in 'Of Eloquence'; see also *EPM* 5.11; 7.12; Appx. 4.5; Dial. 45.

89.23 ***Capuchin***] Capuchins are friars of an austere branch of the order of St Francis dedicated to missionary work. See, further, *NHR* 12.6.

89.25 **vulgar passions]** Dennis discussed the distinction between 'vulgar passion' (that is, 'ordinary passion') and 'enthusiasm' in both *The Advancement and Reformation of Modern Poetry* 5–6 and *The Grounds of Criticism* 4. He linked 'Religious Subjects' to 'stronger Enthusiasms'. (*Critical Works*, 1: 215–18, 338–9.)

89.26 **forged miracles . . . been detected]** Because of the power of enthusiasm and the problem of forgery, claims of the miraculous had for centuries been placed under clerical and judicial inspection in the Roman Catholic Church. Standards in canon law determined authenticity, and few claims of reported miracles withstood official scrutiny. On the origins of the practice, see Michael E. Goodich, *Violence and Miracle*, 4–14.

90.5 **ignorant and barbarous nations]** Similar arguments are found in Hobbes, *Leviathan* 37.5, 10–13; Fréret, *Examen critique* 12 (especially 1: 189–91); Sherlock, *The Trial of the Witnesses*, 44 ff., 56 ff.

90.17 **nothing mysterious or supernatural in the case]** Polybius,[B] an author Hume commonly mentions, pursued a general strategy of finding natural causes of proclaimed 'miracles'. Dryden, another author mentioned by Hume, reflected on this strategy in 'Character of Polybius' (p. 27).

90.26 **scorn by all the wise and judicious]** Many writers manifested an interest in wonders that are either marvellous or miraculous. An informative list of these

writers and of the 'wise and judicious' who scorned the reports is found in the text, notes, and index of Middleton's *A Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers*. Hume was aware of this book, which was published late in the year of the first edition of *EHU* (with a 1749 date). See 'My Own Life' 8, in *Letters*, 1: 3; and letter of 20 June 1758, to Andrew Millar, *Letters*, 1: 282.

90.31 **Alexander**[B] . . . **Lucian**[B] **tells]** Lucian tells how Alexander of Abonuteichos, or Alexander the False Prophet, became celebrated as an oracle. Alexander and a friend perpetrated a hoax to deceive gullible citizens of his home region of Paphlagonia. Using magic, they created an illusion in which Asclepias, the god of healing, emerged from a goose egg in the figure of a snake with a human head. According to Lucian, the crowd followed Alexander 'full of religious fervour and crazed with expectations' (*Alexander, or the False Prophet* 1–61, especially 13–14).

91.4 **Marcus Aurelius**[B]] As Roman emperor, the Stoic philosopher Marcus Aurelius ruled over Paphlagonia. In one battle Alexander delivered a prophecy to Marcus that victory would be assured if two lions and other offerings were cast into the Danube. After Marcus cast the offerings and the lions into the river, the barbarians killed the lions and administered a crushing defeat to the Romans. Alexander coyly explained that the oracle had not revealed to whom the victory would go (*Alexander, or the False Prophet* 47–8).

91.6 **imposture among an ignorant people]** This theme had been discussed in caustic terms in 1746 by French encyclopaedist and man of letters Denis Diderot (1713–84), *Pensées philosophiques* 53–4 (40–1).

91.23 **detect his impostures]** In all editions of *EHU* prior to 1770 Hume placed a footnote to his discussion of Alexander[B] and Lucian[B] (a note apparently added in 1747). The note reads as follows in the first (1748) edition:

> It may here, perhaps, be objected, that I proceed rashly, and form my Notions of *Alexander* merely from the Account, given of him by *Lucian*, a profess'd Enemy. It were indeed to be wish'd, that some of the Accounts publish'd by his Followers and Accomplices had remain'd. The Opposition and Contrast betwixt the Character and Conduct of the same Man, as drawn by a Friend or an Enemy is as strong, even in common Life, much more in these religious Matters, as that betwixt any two Men in the World, betwixt *Alexander* and St. *Paul*, for Instance. See a Letter to *Gilbert West* Esq; on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. *Paul*.

First published anonymously, this letter is entitled *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul, in a Letter to Gilbert West, Esq.* (1747). The author was English politician and man of letters George Lyttelton (1709–73), under whose name the treatise was later published. Lyttelton argued that 'nothing can better point out the difference between imposture and truth, than to observe the different conduct of [Alexander] and St. Paul' (*Works*, 2: 53–7, 63–7, especially 54). Inclusion

of this note (and later its exclusion), as well as the lengthy note on the French miracles in the 1750 edition, provide evidence that Hume continued to revise his essay on miracles long after the draft that had been written prior to the publication of the *Treatise*.

91.36 **destroying a rival system**] Challe used similar arguments about rival systems and contrary miracles in *Difficultés sur la religion*, 84–5, 218 (see ann. 85.38). He argued from conflicting truth claims that result in a lack of conclusive evidence. See, similarly, Diderot, *Pensées philosophiques* 61 (45).

92.1 **miracle of MAHOMET**] A widely disseminated work by Humphrey Prideaux (1648–1724), *The True Nature of Imposture fully Display'd in the Life of Mahomet*, attempted to vindicate Christianity of the charge of imposture over claims of miracles while convicting Islam of the same charge. On the other side, Woolston argued (*Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour*, First Discourse, 38; Third Discourse, 11–12; Fifth Discourse, 11) that if various alleged miracles of Jesus had instead been reported to have been miracles of Muhammad, Christian apologists would have turned the account into a 'confutation' of Islam in which Muhammad is judged a wizard, enchanter, slave to the devil, and the like. For similar remarks, see Fréret (*Examen critique* 13, especially 1: 210–11); Sherlock, *The Trial of the Witnesses*, 11–12; and English deist Matthew Tindal (1655–1733), *Christianity as Old as the Creation* 12 (especially 192, 202–3), 13 (especially 234).

92.2 **barbarous ARABIANS**] Hume is perhaps reflecting a then-typical European view that Islam is a ruthless, vengeful, tyrannical, fraudulent, and intolerant religion. For writings that reflect this estimate, see Wolseley, *The Reasonableness of Scripture-Belief*, 167–71; Grotius, *Truth of the Christian Religion* 6.2, 5–8; Pascal,[B] *Pensées* 241–2 (Levi nos.); Jackson, *An Address to Deists*, 80–5. Hume intimates this thesis in *NHR* 9.3 and 'Of the Standard of Taste' 4.

92.3 **TITUS LIVIUS**[B]] Livy's level of scepticism in reporting on claims of miracles, marvels, and prodigies is a subject of scholarly disagreement. See his *History* 21.62, 24.3.4–8, 26.19.3–10.

n. 24 **cured a blind man . . . *Serapis***] Footnote references: Tacitus,[B] *Histories* 4.81; Suetonius,[B] *Lives of the Caesars* 8, 'Vespasian' 7.2–3. Vespasian[B] is 'the emperor'. The sources in n. 24 relate stories of Vespasian's healing of both a blind man and a crippled man; the healing was allegedly inspired by a divine admonition from Serapis, an Egyptian god worshipped during the time of Ptolemaic Egypt and believed to be capable of performing miraculous cures. Both the example and the sources Hume invokes had been repeatedly mentioned in modern literature on miracles and imposture. See e.g. Grotius, *Truth of the Christian Religion* 4.8; Middleton, *Free Inquiry*, 169–70; Woolston, *Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour*, First Discourse, 61, and Fourth Discourse, 6; Wolseley, *The Reasonableness of Scripture-Belief*, 249–50; Pascal,[B] *Pensées* 257 (Levi nos.); and English deist Charles Blount (1654–93), *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*, 11.

92.25 **Alexander**] There are indications, though no conclusive evidence, that Alexander the Great[B] requested that city-states honour him as a god. Prevailing religious practices permitted the deification of humans. A possible source of Hume's information is *Anabasis of Alexander* 7.23.2 by Greek historian Arrian (2nd c. AD).

92.25 **Demetrius**[B]] Demetrius I of Macedonia pursued the policy of his father (Antigonus I) to reunite Alexander's empire. He was victorious in Cyprus and the Hellenic city-states. Plutarch[B] reported that the Athenians paid extravagant honours to Demetrius, including assigning to him the appellation of 'saviour-god', preparing receptions for him suitable for the gods, and acknowledging his capacity to deliver oracles (*Lives*, 'Demetrius' 10–13, 24–6).

92.32 **Flavian . . . "Utrumque, qui . . . pretium"**] From AD 69 to 96 the Roman empire was ruled by the Flavian family, which included Vespasian[B] and his two sons Titus and Domitian. Tacitus[B] (*Histories* 4.81) concludes his account with the Latin quoted by Hume ('*Utrumque, qui* . . .), which may be translated, 'Those who were present recount both incidents even now, when there is nothing to gain from deceit.'

92.36 **Cardinal de Retz**[B]] De Retz relates in his *Mémoires* (a 1731 edn. of which is in the Hume Library) the story of the doorkeeper of the cathedral (*Œuvres*, 974):

> I was shown a man employed to light the lamps, which are vast in number. I was told that he had been seen, at the door of the church, for seven years with only one leg; whereas I saw him there with two legs. The dean and all the prebends assured me that the whole town had seen it just as they had; and that if I would stay only two days longer, I could speak to more than 20,000 persons from the neighbourhood who had seen him, as well as to people from the town. He had recovered his leg, according to what they said, by anointing himself with some oil from his lamps. Every year they celebrate a holiday in honour of this miracle, with an incredible show of people.

De Retz's comments on the miracle suggest, but do not clearly express, the view that Hume attributed to him.

93.31 **tomb of Abbé Paris**[B]] The deacon François de Pâris was known for his sanctity and charitableness. After his death numerous followers maintained that miraculous cures occurred at his tomb in the cemetery of the Église Saint-Médard. These cures were sometimes accompanied by violent convulsions, allegedly signifying a struggle between life and death for the sick person.

93.31 **famous Jansenist**] Pâris[B] was a Jansenist, that is, a follower of the doctrinal system of Bishop Cornelius Jansen[B] (Cornelius Jansenius). In his major work, *Augustinus* (pub. posthumously, 1640), Jansen promoted Augustinian teachings about original sin, divine grace, gratuitous predestination, and moral austerity. His views had been criticized by leading Jesuits, including Luis de Molina[B] (see below,

ann. n. 25, p. 180), on grounds that they divested free will and individual merit of all significance. A series of papal condemnations of Jansenism culminated in the papal bull *Unigenitus* (1713), which became French law in 1730 and caused a sharp decline in the strength of the Jansenist movement.

Despite this opposition, Jansenism enjoyed popular support, including that of Arnauld,[B] author of *De la fréquente communion* (*On Frequent Communion*, 1643), which infuriated Jesuits and boosted him into position as a leading Jansenist; Pascal[B] (whose *Provincial Letters* vigorously attacked Jesuit casuistry and Molinism); and Nicole.[B] See, further, ann. n. 25.

93.34 **holy sepulchre]** Crowds appeared daily at the tomb of Pâris,[B] with many people engaging in acts of religious enthusiasm and ecstasy. So extraordinary were the 'convulsionnaires de Saint-Médard' that the cemetery was closed in 1732. The practices continued none the less. Although the proclaimed miracles were among the most widely examined and witnessed in modern times, Jesuits and Protestants alike rejected both the testimonials and the surrounding practices.

94.1 **refute or detect them.[25]]** Note 25 was added in the second, 1750 edition. Between the first and second editions Middleton published *A Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers*, which contained (223–6) an account of the French miracles and supportive testimony that is relevantly similar to the account in Hume's note. Middleton mentioned similar sources. These events in France occurred approximately two years prior to Hume's visit to La Flèche, where he wrote his essay on miracles. He could have become aware of these events during this visit and could also have drawn inspiration from Middleton's presentation.

n. 25 **Mons. Montgeron[B]]** Footnote reference: Louis-Basile Carré de Montgeron, *La Verité des miracles operés par l'intercession de m. de Pâris, demontrée contre m. l'archevêque de Sens*. This book provides detailed discussions of several cures, each supported by a body of testimonial evidence and medical documentation. Montgeron regarded these 'demonstrations' as adequate to support the claim of miraculous cures. The book also provides responses to critics. The particular case of Marguerite Thibault[B] is discussed eight entries below.

n. 25 **martyr to the cause]** In his zeal for the Jansenist cause, Montgeron[B] went unannounced to the court of Louis XV at Versailles on 29 July 1737 to hand-deliver a copy of his work. He found his way to the royal dining-room, offered the copy of his book to the king, and issued a warning that Rome and the Jesuits posed a threat to the king's power. For this act he was later arrested by agents of the lieutenant of police, Hérault[B] (see below), and imprisoned. Montgeron placed in the front matter to the book a separate 'Epistre au roy' that explains why he 'took the liberty' of going to Versailles (*La Verité des miracles*, pp. i–ix).

Three years later Antoine Vinchon Des Voeux published a detailed reply to Montgeron, under the title *Critique generale du livre de Mr. de Montgeron, sur les miracles de Mr. l'Abbé Pâris*. Des Voeux tried to 'reveal by the very materials that M. de Montgeron produces, that the facts he publishes are not true' ('Table des lettres',

let. 8). Middleton (*Free Inquiry*, 223–6) and other British authors wrote on this controversy.

Hume's friend the Revd Robert Wallace (1679–1771) wrote a manuscript entitled 'Observations on the Account of the Miracles of the Abbé Paris'. Wallace characterized Montgeron as a bigot bewitched by the cause and the party of the Jansenists ('Observations on the Account', p. iii).

n. 25 ***Recueil . . . l'Abbé* PARIS]** Footnote reference: *Recueil des miracles operés au tombeau de m. de Paris Diacre*. . . . pub. with: *Second recueil des miracles operés par l'intercession de m. de Paris*; *Réflexions sur les miracles operés au tombeau de m. de Paris Diacre*; and *Acte passé pardevant notaires, contenant plusieurs pièces au sujet du miracle operé en la personne de mademoiselle Hardouin*.

The *Recueil* is an anthology of investigatory evidence about four miraculous cures allegedly performed at the tomb of Pâris.[B] Political pressure caused a delay in publication. On 13 August 1731 twenty-three curés (priests) addressed a formal request to the archbishop of Paris to investigate further the alleged cures. The *Recueil* materials were among the documents accompanying this petition, which called for the archbishop to publish and promote them as records of 'true miracles' (*Recueil* 1). Without waiting for a reply, the curés had the formal request and the *Recueil* published (anonymously). Enraged, the archbishop decided not to reply. On 4 October 1731 twenty-two curés sent another formal request for an investigation (Kreiser, *Miracles*, 93–6, 131–5).

In final published form the first *Recueil* is adjoined to the second *Recueil*. There follows a section *Réflexions sur les miracles*, which provides a distinct perspective on the data about miracles provided in the two anthologies. A defence is mounted of the miracles of Pâris and his followers: They 'claim the old truth of faith against a decision of the Pope' (1, 4–5). A fourth part of the book, *Acte passé pardevant notaires*, is a first-person retelling of the miracle of Louise Hardouin.

n. 25 **Cardinal NOAILLES[B]]** Cardinal Louis Antoine Noailles attempted to thwart the French government's efforts to have Jansenism condemned by clerical authorities in France and Rome. A series of papal condemnations of Jansenism culminated in the papal bull *Unigenitus* (1713). Noailles and various bishops refused to accept the bull without an explanation from Rome. When the papacy rebuffed Noailles, there ensued a major social and political battle, with hundreds of pamphlets and books published by each side. Cardinal André-Hercule de Fleury (1653–1743) attempted to convert Noailles to the papal position. Feeble, ill, aged, and under pressure from Church officials and friends alike, Noailles retracted his opposition on 11 October 1728. He died in 1729.

The *Réflexions sur les miracles* bears the (here translated) subtitle *Collection of information . . . drawn up by order of the Cardinal de Noailles, &c*. This collection of 'information' includes prepared responses to questions that might be asked of a person called before the lieutenant of police to testify on matters such as the movement's views on the bull *Unigenitus*. The reflections do not appear to have been

written by Noailles, but the introduction to the first *Recueil* states that Noailles ordered the investigation into the miracles collected in the *Recueil*.

n. 25 **successor in the archbishopric**] The successor to Noailles[B] was Archbishop Vintimille of Aix,[B] who supported the bull *Unigenitus*. Vintimille collaborated with his friend Fleury and with Hérault[B] (see below), and their influence spread to religious orders, congregations, and seminaries.

n. 25 **Molinist party**] The reference is to a sectarian division between Jansenists and Jesuits. Molina[B] published an influential theological system in 1588, subsequently known as Molinism. His book divided Spanish and French theologians: the Jesuits supported it, while Thomists and Jansenists opposed it.

Molinists became politically active, and 'Molinistes' became a party that clashed with the Jansenists. Molinism was often treated in France as a virtual synonym for 'Jesuit perspective'. Hume critically discusses Jansenists and Molinists in 'Of Superstition and Enthusiasm' 10. (See also ann. n. 25 below on Hérault.[B])

n. 25 **Mademoiselle Le Franc**[B]] A confrontation occurred over the allegedly miraculous cure of Anne Le Franc (also Lefranc). She visited Saint-Médard, requesting a miracle. Within a few days her symptoms were relieved. Her blindness, paralysis, and other infirmities allegedly disappeared. Anonymous pro-Jansenists assembled detailed supporting information, including testimony from 120 witnesses, and circulated it publicly. The Jesuits worked to discredit it, and Vintimille[B] sent his own investigators. His actions infuriated the Jansenists, who appealed to parliament. (Kreiser, *Miracles*, 120–6, 136–8.)

n. 25 **Mons. Herault**[B]] The lieutenant of police, René Hérault, attempted to suppress the Jansenists. His collaboration with Fleury and Vintimille[B] gave him special authority. He employed undercover informers and intimidated and arrested Jansenists. He also hired established physicians to discredit Jansenist claims of miracles. None the less, he was unable to stem the growth of the Jansenist movement until he was given authority in 1732 to close the Église Saint-Médard, where Abbé Pâris[B] was buried.

n. 25 **Thibault**[B]] Hérault[B] attempted to discredit the cure of Marguerite Thibault, whose 'documented' miraculous healing is presented in Montgeron[B] and in the *Second Recueil* (17–41). Thibault was an elderly apoplectic who had been declared incurable. Her left side was completely paralysed; various areas of her body were covered with festering ulcers; and her torso was disfigured from excessive swelling. She was carried to the tomb of Pâris[B] on 19 June 1731. Approximately fifteen minutes after her arrival she felt a warmth run along the entire left side of her body, and noticed movement. She summoned three eminent doctors familiar with her case to be witnesses. Each testified that it was impossible to deny the evidence of the miracle, and her servant witnessed that the sores were healed and that fresh new skin had taken their place. See especially Montgeron, *La Vérité des miracles*, 'Miracle operé sur Marguerite Thibault', 1–8.

n. 25 DE SYLVA[B]] News of the miracle of Marguerite Thibault[B] spread quickly through Paris, to the dismay of Hérault,[B] who engaged the physician Jean-Baptiste Silva to examine the case. Montgeron[B] criticized this intervention:

> The famous M. Silva is requested on his [Hérault's] behalf to see the miraculously cured [woman]. . . . We leave it to speculation whether the wish to repay the favours of M. Hérault obliged him [Silva] to adjust his report to the views and inclinations of the magistrate. . . .
>
> M. Silva, doctor of the court summoned by M. Hérault on the 27th of June, eight days after the miracle, who, despite all investigations, did not know how to find any trace of either the hydrops [dropsy] or the paralysis and is tempted to believe that Miss Thibault never had either. (Montgeron, *La Vérité des miracles*, 'Miracle operé sur Marguerite Thibault', 8, 10.)

n. 25 **JERICHO . . . rams horns]** a reference to the collapse of the walls of Jericho at the sounding of trumpets (shofars, or ram's-horn trumpets). These trumpets signalled attacks; the trumpet was also associated with God's judgement of the world. See Josh. 6: 5–20. The ram's horn had its own exalted place; see Exod. 19: 13 and Pss. 81: 3; 98: 6.

n. 25 **prison of every apostle]** Several of Jesus's apostles were imprisoned. In a dramatic case involving Paul, an earthquake shook the prison. See Acts 16: 23–6; also Acts 5: 19; 12: 4–7; 21: 33.

n. 25 **Duc de CHATILLON]** The duc de Châtillon is Paul Sigismond de Montmorency.[B] He is identified in the *Second Recueil* (107–16) in the presentation of the miracle of Blaise Neret, an 8-year-old boy. The duc learned that since birth the boy had been paralysed on the entire left side of his body. A servant of the duc's grandson suggested that Neret might go to the tomb of the Abbé Pâris.[B] In July 1731 Neret went and two days later felt pains on his paralysed side. Within two additional days he was allegedly cured. Upon seeing Neret and his improved condition, the duc became convinced of the authenticity of the miracle.

n. 25 **PORT-ROYAL]** This Jansenist monastery near Paris exerted an impressive influence on French intellectuals in the late 17th century. At Port-Royal Arnauld,[B] Nicole,[B] and Pascal[B] wrote treatises for the Jansenists, and Arnauld and Nicole there wrote *Logic or the Art of Thinking*.

n. 25 **threatened by the JESUITS]** Port-Royal represented a challenge to the Jesuit monopoly on education and spiritual doctrine. Arnauld,[B] in particular, responded vigorously to the Jesuits and other critics of the doctrines of Jansen.[B] Despite his efforts (and those of others), the Jesuits prevailed politically. A papal bull in 1708 abolished Port-Royal, and its buildings were razed in 1710.

n. 25 **RACINE[B] gives an account]** Footnote reference: Jean Racine, *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal*. In a narrative of the 'miracle of the holy thorn', Racine (a student at the monastery) explains how Pascal's niece Marguerite Périer was cured of what

physicians believed an incurable problem: a painful, inflamed ulcer that penetrated the bony structure around the corner of her left eye. Pus drained from a hole in the centre, creating a nauseating stench. On 24 March 1656 Monsieur de la Potherie, a collector of relics, had brought to the nuns of Port-Royal what he claimed to be a thorn from the crown worn by Christ at his crucifixion. A nun was inspired to apply the thorn to Marguerite's eye, and that evening the inflammation disappeared and the pain ceased. Many witnessed this miracle of the holy thorn, which was subsequently declared a verified miracle by cardinal de Retz[B] and the physician who had declared the ulcer incurable, M. Dalencé (Racine, *Abrégé*, 77–85; Cat. 1742 edn. of *Abrégé*, 97–105). Racine's son Louis devoted a few passages in his *Mémoires sur la vie de Jean Racine* to his father's religious belief, but mentions nothing about miracles (81, 179–80).

n. 25 **famous Pascal[B]]** Jansenists were committed to forms of moral austerity. Pâris[B] and Pascal were devoted to these ideals. Pascal gave up serious work in mathematics after an intense religious conversion and devoted himself almost exclusively to Jansenist ideals, including the goal of living humbly and plainly while serving the poor. In *EPM* (Dial. 54–6) Hume refers to Pascal's obdurate commitments, including his self-effacement and view of himself as helpless and sinful, as 'ridiculous superstitions'.

Hume's statement in this paragraph about 'the famous Pascal, whose sanctity of life . . . is well known' was expressed in a different form, together with a reference, in the 1750 edition of *EHU*. In this edition only, Hume maintained that Pascal 'was a Believer, in that and in many other Miracles, which he had less Opportunity of being inform'd of. See his Life' (*EHU*, 1750: 499 n.). Hume's reference is to *La Vie de m. Pascal*, written by Pascal's elder sister, Gilberte Périer. She reported that Pascal judged the miracle of the holy thorn (and other miracles) to count as a vindication of Christianity (47–53). Some of his thoughts about miracles became passages in his *Pensées* 200, 211, 410–11, 421–50 (Levi nos.). Several of the relevant fragments on miracles in this work are in Gilberte's handwriting, dictated by her brother.

n. 25 **bishop of Tournay[B]]** The 'bishop of Tournay', Gilbert de Choiseul du Plessis-Praslin (Gilbert de Choyseul du Plessy-Praslain on the title page of his book *Mémoires touchant la religion*), took part in negotiations to restore peace to the Church, at that time split over Jansenism. These negotiations were unsuccessful. In his *Abrégé* Racine[B] maintains that the bishop used the story of the miracle of the holy thorn to present a brilliant proof of the truth of religion. However, Racine also indicates that the majority who knew of this report of the miracle received it with indifference (77–8).

n. 25 **free-thinkers]** those who weigh the evidence and judge for themselves in matters of religion. Bayle's *Dictionary* was often viewed as a resource for free-thinkers, but the term gained notoriety from Collins's *Discourse of Free-Thinking* (1713). Subsequently it was applied to deists and atheists. Collins and others were

attacked for free-thinking by Bentley, in *Remarks Upon a Discourse of Free-Thinking*; Irish writer and Anglican clergyman Jonathan Swift (1667–1745), *Mr. C——ns's Discourse of Free-Thinking* (especially 3–19); English mathematician William Whiston (1667–1752), *Reflections on an Anonymous Pamphlet, intituled*, A Discourse of Free-Thinking; and English bishop and pamphleteer Benjamin Hoadly (1676–1761), *Queries Recommended to the Authors of the late* Discourse of Free-Thinking. Berkeley,[B] who disapproved of Collins, attacked free-thinking in contributions to the *Guardian* and in *Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*; later he used these materials as a basis for a criticism of free-thinking in *Alciphron* 1. Similar exchanges were occurring in France; see John S. Spink, *French Free-Thought from Gassendi to Voltaire*.

n. 25 **queen-regent of France]** This queen regent was Anne of Austria,[B] daughter of Philip III of Spain. She married and separated from Louis XIII of France. While acting as queen regent for her son Louis XIV, she chose Jesuit-educated Cardinal Jules Mazarin (1602–61) as prime minister. Mazarin (and Louis XIV after him) viewed Jansenism as opposed to monarchical government and endeavoured to demolish it.

The deeply religious queen regent was embarrassed by the controversy over the miracle of the holy thorn. She sent her personal physician, M. Félix, to investigate the reports of physicians concerning the healing. He became convinced that a miracle had occurred. Racine[B] maintains that 'the piety of the Queen Mother was touched by the visible protection of God over these nuns' (*Abrégé*, 84–7). However, the queen issued no public statement and avoided the theological controversy between Jansenists and Jesuits.

95.2 **Philippi or Pharsalia]** Philippi was a town in Macedonia in which the army of Mark Antony defeated Brutus and Cassius in 42 BC. Pharsala or Pharsalus was a city in Thessaly, now northern Greece, near where Julius Caesar in 48 BC conquered Pompey in the battle called *Pharsalia*; see ann. 22.25.

95.9 **Herodotus[B]]** Marvels prominent in fifth-century Greece appear in Herodotus' stories. He gives oracles, portents, dreams, omens, wonders, and divinations a role in the explanation of human behaviour and the formation of national policies. Herodotus sometimes assesses them piously, at other times sceptically. For an example, see *History* 8.135.

95.9 **Plutarch[B]]** In his *Lives* Plutarch joins sceptical philosophical commentary with historical reports. He mentions divine marvels, signs, and miracles in which a deity contributes to an outcome; see 'Camillus' 6.1–3; 'Gaius Marcius Coriolanus' 37–8; 'Dion' 24.4–5; 'Themistocles' 30; and 'Brutus' 36–7. In *Moralia*, 'The Oracles at Delphi', prophecy occasionally involves divine providence. An example of an apparent miracle is found in 'Dion': 'The water of the sea which washed the base of the acropolis was sweet and potable for a whole day, as all who tasted it could see.' Plutarch's reports are centred on oracles, portents, divination, and dreams rather than miracles, but some do involve violations of laws of nature.

95.9 **Mariana**[B]] Juan de Mariana reports several miracles in his *General History of Spain*. An example is:

> The Infidels attack'd the mouth of the Cave, powring in a Shower of Stones and Darts. Here the Hand of God appeared in defence of the Christians; for all the Weapons cast against them, flew back upon the *Moors*, with great slaughter of them. At this Miracle the Infidels stood astonished, and the Christians taking heart, rusht out upon them, the Fight was Disorderly, but the Enemy amazed at what they had seen, turned their Backs and fled. 20,000 were killed in the Battle and Pursuit, the rest . . . fled to [a] Field. . . . There another Miracle was wrought, which was, that near a Farm, called *Causegadia*, part of a Mountain, with all that were upon it, fell into the River, by which a great number of *Barbarians* perished. (p. 103)

95.9 **Bede**[B]] Beda or the Venerable Bede had a reputation for reliability. In 'The Life and Miracles of Saint Cuthbert' Bede reports numerous miracles. In his best-known work, *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, he occasionally reports miracles and cites authorities or evidence in support of them. One example, which resembles the miracle of the holy thorn mentioned by Hume above, is this:

> Germanus, full of the Holy Ghost, invoked the Trinity, and—taking into his hands a little bag filled with relics of the saints, which hung about his neck—applied it to the girl's eyes, which were immediately delivered from darkness and filled with the light of truth. The parents rejoiced, and the people were amazed at the miracle; and after that day wicked opinions were so fully displaced from the minds of all that they ardently embraced the doctrine of the religious authorities. (*Ecclesiastical History* 1.18 (1: 84–5))

Bede is forthright in citing his authorities or evidence, but he did not personally witness the marvels and miracles that he reported.

In a spirit resembling Hume's, Woolston mentions Bede's reports of miracles in *Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour*, Fourth Discourse (66–7); Fifth Discourse (60).

96.4 **pious frauds]** a widely used expression. In reporting on fantastic stories and miracles, Wollaston discusses 'frauds pious and impious' in *Religion of Nature Delineated* 3.16. Collins (*Discourse of Free-Thinking*, 92–3) and Bentley (*Remarks Upon a Late Discourse of Free-Thinking* 35–6) debated pious and impious frauds in biblical translations. Woolston's *Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour* contains suggestions that many miracles are pious frauds; these issues of fraud and Woolston's views are taken up in Sherlock, *The Trial of the Witnesses*, 32 ff., 51–3.

96.6 ***avidum genus auricularum***] Footnote reference: Lucretius,[B] *De rerum natura* 4.594 (598 in older editions). The expression in Lucretius is 'humanum genus est avidum nimis auricularum', which means 'the human species is too eager for gossipy ears'. Hume's shortened version, *avidum genus auricularum*, means 'the tribe with an

eager ear for gossip'. Lucretius uses the full expression while discussing how miraculous tales are exchanged and spread. Hume applies to a section of the population a phrase which Lucretius had originally applied to all humanity.

96.25 **infancy of new religions . . . perished beyond recovery]** This paragraph appears to be a direct denial of claims by Butler (*Analogy* 2.6–7) that a higher standard of evidence was required for claims of miracles in the infancy of religions than in the 18th century. See related discussions in French literary figure Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle (1657–1757), *History of Oracles* 9–11; Locke,[B] *Third Letter for Toleration* 10; Christian scholar and early Church Father Origen (2nd–3rd c. AD), *Contra Celsum* 1.27, 2.46, 7.7–8.

97.8 **foundation . . . system of religion]** Biblical miracles are regarded as among the main proofs of Christianity in Tillotson,[B] 'Of the Tryal of the Spirits' (*Works*, sermon 21); Clarke,[B] *Discourse* (*Works*, 2: 695–7, 701) and *Sermons* (*Works*, 2: 81–2); Butler (*Analogy* 2.7); and Jackson (*An Address to Deists*, 25–8). Berkeley[B] seems to support a claim to proof in *Alciphron* 6.3, 30, as does Locke[B] in *A Discourse of Miracles* (*Works*, 9: 256–65). See also claims of proof in Grotius, *Truth of the Christian Religion* 1.18, 2.6–7, 5.2; Edward Stillingfleet, *Origines sacræ* 2.3, 6, 8–10; and Toland, *Christianity Not Mysterious* 2.3.19, 3.4.69–76. Hume comments on miracles as intended to establish points of religion in a letter to Blair (*Letters*, 1: 350).

Fréret (*Examen critique*, especially 1: 13, 189–92) raised questions similar to Hume's about whether the very biblical reports of miracles invoked by several of the above writers constitute 'sufficient' proofs of religious belief.

98.21 **Bacon[B]]** Footnote reference: Francis Bacon, *Novum organum* 2.29. Bacon first published this passage in Latin. Hume quoted the passage in all editions of *EHU* from 1756 to 1768, always in a note and exclusively in Latin. The Latin was carried into the text in the 1770 edition. In the 1772 edition Hume replaced the Latin with the translation found in the present text.

98.33 ***Faith*, not on reason]** Theologians and philosophers had debated issues of 'faith to the exclusion of reason' for centuries. Montaigne and Bayle[B] were prominent figures. Montaigne commented on the inability of reason to establish truths that could be known by faith, whereas Bayle found religious tenets of faith to be in opposition to reason. Various formulations of St Augustine and Pascal[B] were often mentioned in literature on the subject. In *Dialogues* 1 Hume suggests that Locke[B] was the first Christian openly to assert that '*faith* was nothing but a species of *reason*'; see Locke, *Essay* 4.17.23–4.18.11. In *Christianity Not Mysterious* Toland attempted to defend the Christian religion by appeal to reason (rather than miracles, revelation, or tradition), insisting that the sharp contrast often drawn between faith and reason is untenable.

98.37 ***Pentateuch*]** The first five books of the Hebrew Bible, or the five books of Moses, report numerous miracles, some listed by Hume later in this paragraph.

99.2 **writer and historian]** Prior to Hume prominent writers, including Stillingfleet, had defended the soundness of biblical history. They incorporated accounts of miracles and the history related in the Pentateuch, often using appeals to common sense and historiographical standards. See Stillingfleet, *Origines sacræ* 2.1–4, 7–10.

99.18 **applied . . . to prophecies]** As with miracles, there was a large literature on prophecies (understood as divinely inspired instruction as well as the prediction of what is to come). Stillingfleet associated miracles and prophecies (*Origines sacræ* 2.6–10), and Hobbes regarded miracles as a mark of a true prophet—albeit not a solely sufficient mark because 'false prophets may have the power of miracles' (*Leviathan* 32.7). Influential free-thinkers who made connections between prophecies and miracles are Dutch philosopher Baruch de Spinoza (1632–77), *Theologico-Political Treatise* 1–3, 6, and Collins, *A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* 1.6–11.

99.21 **foretel future events]** In *Analogy* 2.1.1 Butler discusses the importance of foretelling events in order to add credibility to Christian religious teachings about miracles.

SECTION 11

SECTION 11 . . . FUTURE STATE] In the first edition of 1748 Hume gave this section the title '*Of the* Practical Consequences *of* Natural Religion'. The term 'natural religion' (the project of deriving religious principles and doctrines of God from reason and science) did not appear after the 1748 edition, yet Section 11 is arguably on the topic of natural religion and includes subjects addressed in greater depth in Hume's *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*. Neither of Hume's two titles seems to quite capture what he is attempting in Section 11; he may have been disguising his philosophical and religious targets both by his titles and by his transfer of responsibility to historical and imaginary characters for the views and arguments found in the section. Section 11 may have been modelled on the debate between Stratonicians and Stoics in Bayle, *Continuation des Pensées diverses*.

PARTICULAR PROVIDENCE] A *particular* providence is to be contrasted to a *general* providence. Particular providence is God's oversight of, and potential intervention in, the affairs of particular individuals; general providence is God's provision for everything through the universal laws of nature. The former includes a range of religious views about divine judgements, rewards, and punishments. For a delineation of the distinction, see Richard Price, *Four Dissertations*, 7. Malebranche[B] relies on this distinction (predominantly using the language of 'general will' and 'particular will') for his arguments in *Treatise on Nature and Grace* 1.43, 56–7; 2.3, 45; and Illustration.

100.12 **banishment of Protagoras[B]]** Ancient authorities, including Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 9.51–2, and Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Physicists* 1.55–60,

reported that Protagoras was prosecuted for heresy and banished from Athens because his philosophy raised questions about the existence of the gods. Some modern scholars have been reluctant to accept the accuracy of this information (Guthrie, *Sophists*, 262–3). Sextus' report on Protagoras is bound together with a discussion of Epicurus[B] on the same problem.

100.13 **death of Socrates[B]**] Socrates was found guilty of impiety (for not acknowledging the gods recognized by the State) and of corrupting the youth of Athens. Both Plato[B] (*Apology*; *Crito*) and Xenophon (*Memorabilia*) suggest that the charge of impiety was argued in vague and misleading terms.

100.16 **Epicurus[B]**] Although times were troubled in Athens, Epicurus lived undisturbed. The person and theories of Epicurus return in the imaginary speech beginning at *EHU* 11.6.

100.17 **Epicureans**] Epicureans were polytheists who defended a mechanistic view of nature that left little place for particular providence. Hume once commented to Gilbert Elliot that 'a profest Atheist' and 'an Epicurean' are 'little or nothing different' (*Letters*, 1: 155). The Stoic view that there is a providential arrangement in the universe contrasted sharply. (See Lucian,[B] *Zeus Rants* 3–4, 16–17, 36–51, and the works by Lucian cited in footnotes 28–30 immediately below.) These interpretations were prominent in the 18th century. Epicurus[B] was a symbol both of free-thinking—as illustrated by these perceptions of his presumed disciples Hobbes and Collins—and of atheism and materialism—as illustrated by many detractors mentioned in the annotations below. Hume and his critics assume both of these receptions of Epicurus' teachings.

n. 28 **Lucian[B]**] Footnote reference: Lucian, *The Drinking Party*, *or Lapithae* 9. Lucian satirizes learned disputes. He describes the arrival of Hermon the Epicurean, a priest of the Twin Brethren. Zenothemis the Stoic ridicules the idea that an Epicurean could be a priest.

100.20 **every sect of philosophy**] The wisest emperor is Marcus Aurelius[B] (see ann. 91.4), and the sects of philosophy are the four schools mentioned by Lucian[B] in the source cited in n. 29: Platonic, Stoic, Epicurean, and Peripatetic.

nn. 29–30 **Lucian.[B] . . . Dio[B]**] Footnote references: (29) Lucian, *The Eunuch* 3, 8. (30) Lucian, *The Eunuch* 3; Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 72.31.3. Lucian's character Lycinus explains that the emperor established a considerable allowance for these philosophers. Dio Cassius notes that 'When Marcus had come to Athens . . . he established teachers at Athens in every branch of knowledge, granting these teachers an annual salary.'

101.14 **Epicurus[B]**] Stillingfleet (*Origines sacræ* 3.3) began his treatment of providence and the origin of evil with Epicurus' arguments, which he proceeded to 'refute'. A comparable strategy is adopted by Cheyne, *Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion* 2.2–10, 14; Wolseley, *The Reasonableness of Scripture-Belief*, 11 ff., 17 ff.; and Tillotson,[B] 'The Wisdom of Being Religious' (*Works*, sermon 1; and, on

providence, sermon 36). A congenial portrait of Epicurus as a free-thinker is found in Collins, *Discourse of Free-Thinking*, 129–31.

101.15 **loosen . . . the ties of morality]** See also 11.10. In *Dialogues* 12.10 Hume has his characters debate the proposition that 'a future state is so strong and necessary a security to morals, that we never ought to abandon or neglect it'. A connection between providence and a future state (immortality) and the safety of public morals was often assumed in philosophy and theology, where Epicurus[B] was commonly denigrated. See Clarke,[B] *Discourse* (*Works*, 2: 600–2); Wolseley, *The Reasonableness of Scripture-Belief*, 12 ff., 23–38, 45, 50, 67–9; Tillotson,[B] 'Success not always answerable to the probability of Second Causes' (*Works*, sermon 36).

In the tract by Wishart that precipitated *A Letter from a Gentleman*, Hume had been accused of 'sapping the Foundations of Morality', a charge bundled with accusations about his views on God and the soul. See the accusation in par. 19 and the response to the charges in pars. 36 ff. of the *Letter*.

101.34 **white beans . . . black one]** Beans or pebbles were used for voting in ancient Athens and elsewhere in Greece. Urns were used to collect the beans. White beans signified agreement or consent, black signified disagreement or dissent. Beans were also used as lots by which public officers were elected. In jury trials jurors used the white bean to vote for innocence, the black for guilty. Pericles once used the beans to determine who would fight and who would feast (Plutarch,[B] *Lives*, 'Pericles' 27.2).

102.11 **religious philosophers]** These philosophical theologians attempt to rely on reason to prove the existence or build doctrines of God (or gods) and to establish religious doctrines without explicit appeal to revelation. There is no reason to think that Hume is referring exclusively to ancient religious philosophers known to Epicureans, such as Plato,[B] Aristotle,[B] and the early Stoics (though Stoic arguments for providence are presented below). Modern religious philosophers who are candidates for 'religious philosophers' include Clarke[B] (see e.g. *Discourse*, proposition 3 (*Works*, 2: 527 ff.)) and Butler (see e.g. *Analogy*, introduction and 2.7). Before them Henry More had developed an intricate account of divine providence in *An Antidote against Atheism* 2.5–12. See also the reference in *Letter from a Gentleman* 27–8 to prominent theses and arguments in the work of Tillotson,[B] Clarke, and Descartes.[B] See, further, Cheyne, *Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion*; Wilkins, *The Principles and Duties of Natural Religion*; and Bentley, *Eight Boyle Lectures on Atheism*, esp. lectures 6–8.

102.16 **order, beauty, and wise arrangement]** an apparent reference to those who employ some form of the design argument for the existence of God (see Hume's *Dialogues*, parts 2–3, 5, 7). Stoic arguments from the order of nature to a cause are the nominal preoccupation here, but Hume's depiction and reference to atoms suggest the reasoning of modern philosophers such as Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 2.1.4.3, which is directed in part against 'the most devoted disciples of Epicurus'; and Cheyne, who regularly appeals to wise arrangements in the universe in *Philo-*

sophical Principles of Natural Religion. Examples of the reach of such appeals in natural philosophy, often connected to a theory of providence, are found in Keill, *An Introduction to the True Astronomy*, pp. i–ii, vi (citing Cicero[B]); Boyle, *The Christian Virtuoso* (*Works*, 5: 518–22); English naturalist John Ray (1627–1705), *Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of Creation*; Newton,[B] *Mathematical Principles* 3, 'General Scholium' (Motte–Cajori, 544, 546); and Maclaurin, *An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries*, 381–2 (published after *EHU* went to press). See also Berkeley,[B] *Principles* 1.57, 146–54; Grotius, *Truth of the Christian Religion* 1.7, 10–11; Butler, *Analogy*, *passim*; and Bentley, *Eight Boyle Lectures on Atheism*, esp. lectures 6–8.

102.18 **fortuitous concourse of atoms]** This common expression is used in reference to the Epicurean system in Collins, *Human Liberty*, 58; Cheyne, *Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion* 3.2 (p. 76) and 2.1–10 (especially p. 15); and Bentley, 'Matter and Motion cannot Think' (Second Boyle Lecture, 4 (see also 15, 26, 33–4), and Seventh Boyle Lecture, 6). The identical expression is used by Boyle, *The Christian Virtuoso* (*Works*, 5: 519); Berkeley,[B] *Dialogues* 2 (213) (cf. *Alciphron*, dial. 3, §§ 10–11); Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.20.15; Leibniz,[B] *New Essays* (pub. 1765) 4.20.15; Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica* 7; Montaigne, 'Apology for Raymond Sebond' (*Essays* 2.12; Screech, 612); and (shortly after publication of *EHU*) Lord Kames, *Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion*, 320. Attribution of this view to Epicureans is ancient; see Cicero,[B] *De natura deorum* 2.37.93, and the early formulation in Lucretius,[B] *De rerum natura* 1.1021–31.

For modern writers on atomism, see Gassendi, *Syntagma*: Physics 1.3.8 (where he accepts a materialist-atomist hypothesis, while rejecting the fortuitous concourse explanation); Newton,[B] *Mathematical Principles* 3, rule 3 (Motte–Cajori, 398–9) and *Opticks*, query 31; Charleton, *Physiologia Epicuro–Gassendo–Charltoniana* 2.1–4; Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.27.4; and Boyle, *Origin of Forms and Qualities According to the Corpuscular Philosophy*, 'Considerations and Experiments . . . The Theoretical Part', and *The Sceptical Chymist* 1.

102.18 **if chance could produce]** Aristotle[B] criticized the atomism found in classical writers such as Leucippus and his pupil Democritus (both 5th–4th c. BC). Later Epicurus[B] revived atomism with a thesis that atoms occasionally move abruptly at random, some element of chance thereby replacing the determinism of Leucippus and Democritus. Hume may or may not be here alluding to this Epicurean notion of chance; see the annotations on 'chance' in Section 6 above, especially ann. 46.1.

102.20 **justness of this argument]** On the pertinent meaning of 'justness' (exactness and accuracy), see Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'justness'. Hume explores the accuracy of this argument in his *Dialogues*. (See ann. 102.31 below; on chance, in particular, see *Dialogues* 6.12, 9.3, and 9.10.) Many modern religious philosophers denied that the universe could have been formed and evolved from the fortuitous coming together of atoms, and some used the atomic hypothesis to defend a divine

artificer and doctrine of creation. See Bentley, *Eight Boyle Lectures on Atheism*, first lecture; and Charleton, *Physiologia Epicuro–Gassendo–Charltoniana* 2.4 (125–6).

102.23 **I deny a providence and a future state]** See ann. 100.16. Epicurus[B] was typically viewed in Hume's period as the chief spokesperson for the denial of providence and a future state. See ann. 111.7 and a representation of these Epicurean theses in Blount, *Anima mundi* 31. For other aspects of Hume's views on the possibility of a future state, compare his teachings in *THN* 1.4.5, 'Of the immateriality of the soul'; 'Of the Immortality of the Soul' 30; and *Letter from a Gentleman* 8. For an opposing view in modern philosophy that may motivate Hume's thoughts on the subject, see Butler, *Analogy* 1.1.6–7, 11, 20.

102.23 **undermine not the foundations of society]** Since Hume had himself been persecuted by Wishart and others (see ann. 101.15), the Epicurean and Stoic arguments explored here may be motivated by personal experience.

102.31 **unguided force of matter]** Epicureans held that chance, or unguided force, is the foundation of the natural order. Religious philosophers who rejected an explanatory role for chance or unguided force play a role in Hume's *Dialogues* (see parts 6, 8–9). Although no word deriving from 'atom' is mentioned in the latter work, Hume does discuss 'the old Epicurean hypothesis' of 'a finite number of particles' in which 'every possible order or position must be tried an infinite number of times' (8.2).

103.15 **Zeuxis's pictures]** Zeuxis of Heraclea[B] was renowned for excellence in perspective, realism, expression, and subtle use of shade and light. He also created sculptures. See Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Zeuxis'.

103.35 **Jupiter]** By tradition, Jupiter wills the course of human history and foresees the future, while serving as guardian of law, justice, and virtue.

104.14 **golden or silver age]** Hume describes 'the golden age or the reign of Saturn' and compares it to the 'philosophical fiction of the state of nature' in *EPM* 3.14–15 and *THN* 3.2.2.15. Hesiod may be among the unnamed poets; in *NHR* (nn. 1 and 21), Hume refers to Hesiod's *Works and Days* (lines 109–20), which depicts the golden and silver races of mortal men in the time of Saturn (Cronos). See also Hume's distinction between the golden, silver, and iron ages in correspondence of 8 Oct. 1754, to John Wilkes, *Letters*, 1: 195, as well as the discussion of all three ages and the period of Saturn in Ovid,[B] *Metamorphoses* 1.76–150.

104.32 **evil and disorder]** On these themes, see *Dialogues* 10–11 on ill, evil, and disorder.

105.5 **religious hypothesis]** Hume uses the expression 'the religious hypothesis' three times in his *Dialogues* (1.16, 9.10, and 12.5). He also describes Cleanthes' 'hypothesis' as an 'hypothesis of design in the universe' in *Dialogues* 5.13.

105.20 **doctrine . . . in my gardens]** The 'doctrine' is a reference to Epicurus' teaching—in particular, his denial of the creation and the providence of a divine gov-

ernor of the world (see 11.20). 'My gardens' is a reference to the garden at the house of Epicurus[B] and in which he taught. 'The Garden' came to refer to the community of Epicureans.

105.29 **virtue is attended]** Tenets in Epicurean ethics follow, but Hume's argument may be directed against Butler's account of providence and the related theme that God will reward virtuous conduct (though these were fairly standard Christian views). See Butler, *Analogy* 1.2.9, 1.8.5–6, 2.8.26.

106.15 **present scene of things]** Compare Hume's 'Of the Immortality of the Soul' 11: 'if any purpose of nature be clear, we may affirm, that the whole scope and intention of man's creation, so far as we can judge by natural reason, is limited to the present life'.

106.16 **life merely a passage]** In his Index, Hume placed this paragraph under the entry 'immortality'. 'Vain reasoners' might include Plato[B] (*Phaedo*) and St Thomas (*Summa theologiae*). In modern philosophy, influential treatments are found in More, *The Immortality of the Soul* 1.1–2; 2.12, 16–17; 3.1, 11, 14; and Butler, *Analogy* 1.1, 'Of a Future Life'. In 'Of the Immortality of the Soul' 41 Hume refers to a discussion of the 'vanity' of belief in a future life. Hume's writing there (and possibly here) may have been influenced by Pliny's naturalism and direct comparison between the human species and other species. (*Natural History* 7.56; 7.55 in older edns.)

108.27 **by analogy]** Compare Hume's *Dialogues* 2–3, 7–8, on how arguments from design proceed by analogy, esp. at 2.5–8; see also Hume's rule at *EHU* 9.1 above: 'where the objects have not so exact a similarity, the analogy is less perfect, and the inference is less conclusive'.

110.27 **good citizens]** See 11.4 and 11.10. Hume was himself accused of advancing a socially dangerous philosophy. In *A View of the Principal Deistical Writers* (Letter 17 (1: 281–2)), English Presbyterian minister John Leland (1691–1766) accused Hume of being a 'bad influence on the community' because of the arguments he advances in Section 11 of *EHU*.

110.25 **enthusiasm among philosophers]** At the end of 'A Dialogue' (published with *EPM*) Hume speaks of a philosophical enthusiasm such as that found in Greek philosopher Diogenes of Sinope (4th c. BC). On enthusiasm generally, see *EPM* 3.7, 3.24; 'Of Superstition and Enthusiasm' 3, 6–8; *Dialogues* 12; *NHR* 12.22; and *History of England*, chs. 34, 40, 47, 55, 57–62.

Publications and sermons that cautioned about the follies of enthusiasm (forceful but misguided pretence to inspiration) were common before and during Hume's lifetime. Diverse philosophers had commented on the subject, including More and Locke.[B] In his influential *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus* More called for reliance on reason and the development of a criterion to distinguish genuine from false inspiration in religion. Sect. 42 of this work treats 'Philosophical Enthusiasm'; see also sects. 1–8, 18–24, 28–32, 48–51, 55–61, 67. Locke portrayed enthusiasm as

destructive of the truths of both reason and revelation (*Essay* 4.19). Also critical of religious enthusiasts and fanatics were classics scholar Florence Étienne Méric Casaubon (1599–1671), in *A Treatise concerning Enthusiasme*; English poet and preacher Joseph Trapp (1679–1747), *The Nature, Folly, Sin, and Danger of being Righteous Over-much* (which passed through four editions in its first year (1739) and drew several published responses); Addison,[B] *Spectator* 201 (see also 11, 185, 207, 213); Tindal, *Christianity as Old as the Creation* 7 (especially 76–7), 8 (especially 99–100), 10 (especially 126–7), 11 (especially 168–71), 13; and Jonathan Swift, *Discourse* and *Tale of a Tub*.

111.7 **antagonists of EPICURUS[B]]** See the more developed arguments in Hume's *Dialogues*, introduced at 2.24. Antagonists would presumably include ancient antagonists as well as modern antagonists such as Stillingfleet, Cheyne, Tillotson,[B] and Wolseley, as discussed in ann. 101.14 ff. and other 'religious philosophers', as Hume uses the term at *EHU* 12.1.

SECTION 12

ACADEMICAL OR SCEPTICAL] 'Academical' designates one type of 'sceptical' philosophy. See ann. 120.3. Section 12 exhibits a number of parallels with *THN* 1.4.1–4.

112.3 **fallacies of *Atheists*]** Many philosophers of Hume's period attempted to refute atheism or argued that there are no real atheists. The term 'atheist' was applied not only to those who denied the existence of God, but also to those who had no religion, denied God's particular providence, or denied an afterlife (Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'atheist'). Discussion of these issues is found in More, Bentley, Cudworth, John Balguy, Thomas Curteis, Thomas Wise, Richard Blackmore, and Lord Herbert of Cherbury (see Berman, 'The Repression of Atheism', in *A History of Atheism in Britain*, 6–43). Compare Hume's playful comment about the atheism of professor of divinity William Leechman, letter of June 1743, to William Mure of Caldwell, *Letters*, 1: 50; see also the letter of 4 Aug. 1744, to William Mure of Caldwell, *Letters*, 1: 57–8.

Both Hobbes and Spinoza were frequently denounced as atheists, and Hume himself mentioned 'the atheism of Spinoza' (*THN* 1.4.5.17 ff.; repeated in *Letter from a Gentleman* 8). See arguments by Clarke[B] against the atheism of Hobbes and Spinoza in *Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God* (*Works*, 2: title-page, 521, 532–4); and *A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion* (especially *Works*, 2: 600–1, 636–7). See also Bayle's interpretation of Spinoza as the first 'systematical Atheist' (*Dictionary*, 'Spinoza' [A], [N], [P]); similarly, French historian and clergyman Lewis Moreri (1643–80), *Great Historical . . . Dictionary* ('Spinosa'); and Berkeley[B] on Hobbes and Spinoza as atheists (*Dialogues* 2).

112.3 **religious philosophers . . . speculative atheist]** Compare *Dialogues* 1.17. On 'religious philosophers', see ann. 102.11. When Hume says, 'the most religious

philosophers still dispute whether any man can be so blinded as to be a speculative atheist', he is referring to figures such as Berkeley,[B] who reports that 'it hath often been said, there is no such thing as a speculative atheist' (*Alciphron*, Advertisement); Cheyne, who says 'That there are no *Speculative Atheists* . . . seems . . . evident' (*Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion* 3.1); and Curteis, who uses the language of 'speculative atheist' in doubting that such a person has ever existed (*Dissertation on the Unreasonableness, Folly and Danger of Infidelity*, 34).

Tillotson[B] liberally employed the language of 'speculative atheist'; see 'The Wisdom of Being Religious' (*Works*, sermon 1). See also the discussions of 'speculative atheism', Hobbes, and Epicurus[B] in Richard Bentley, 'The Folly of Atheism' (First Boyle Lecture), especially 4–9, 12–13, 35–6; and Beattie's treatment of the distinction between speculative and practical atheists (in commenting on *EHU* 11), in *Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth* 2.6 (487–8 n.).

112.8 **enemy of religion]** Hume might be referring to the ancient sceptics, the sceptics about religion discussed in the previous paragraph, or possibly the Cartesian foundations of scepticism, discussed in the next paragraph. Perhaps any sceptic whose epistemology casts doubt on religious truth claims qualifies. The effect of scepticism (especially Pyrrhonism) on religion is a recurrent theme in Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Pyrrho', especially [B], [C]; and la Mothe Le Vayer, *De la vertu des payens*, 'De Pyrrhon'. See also ann. 122.34 and Hume, *Dialogues* 1.13, 17–20.

112.18 **universal doubt . . . Cartesian doubt]** Compare Descartes,[B] *Meditations*, as well as Malebranche,[B] *Search after Truth* 6.1.1. Hume's remark at *EHU* 12.13 regarding 'the veracity of the Supreme Being' is presumably a reference to the attempt by Descartes[B] to demonstrate the existence of a veracious God. For similar reservations about 'universal doubt', see *Letter from a Gentleman* 21. This language may be the legacy of 'universal scepticism', which was one of the six charges brought against Hume in the Revd Wishart's accusations that eventuated in the writing of this *Letter*.

112.28 **scepticism, when more moderate]** In early modern philosophy influential examples of moderated scepticism, broadly understood, are found in Gassendi, *Syntagma*: Logic, bk. 2, and in his arguments against Aristotelian science and epistemology in *Exercises Against the Aristotelians* (e.g. 2.6.5–6 on scepticism). See also Mersenne, *La Vérité des sciences*, Dedicatory Letter, preface, 1.1–5, 9–15; 2.1; *Questions inouyes* 18; and 'Second Set of Objections' (compiled by Mersenne), in Descartes,[B] *Objections and Replies* (*Philosophical Writings*, 2: 88–91). Hume may also be alluding to those members of the new philosophy who adopted a moderated and constructive form of Cartesian doubt, such as Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica: or Confest Ignorance, the Way to Science*. Their doubts about claims of certainty and championing of experimental methods fused moderate sceptical methods and experimentalism.

113.1 **imbibed from education]** '[E]ducation' suggests absorbing second-hand opinion, with the consequence that a bias is transmitted or that proper learning is

obstructed. Hume treats this subject in *THN* 1.3.9.17–19 to 1.3.10.1. See examples in *EPM* 3.36, 5.3–4; *NHR* 11.3, 12.19, 15.1. See also the strongly worded discussion of the 'prejudice of Custom and Education' in Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica* 16–17; the less strongly worded statement in Boyle, *Reconcileableness of Reason and Religion* 4 (*Works*, 4: 164); and the more guarded presentation in Locke,[B] *Essay* 1.2.27, 1.3.20, 2.21.69, 4.20.9.

113.21 **oar in water . . . pressing one eye]** Compare *THN* 1.4.2.45 for the example of pressing the eye; *THN* 1.4.2 treats perceptual scepticism and examines sceptical arguments. See the classical arguments in Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.36–94, 101–11, 118–35, 140–2, 163. In modern philosophy see Montaigne, 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 632–5, 660–3, 667–9, 673–6) and the perceptive outline of major issues in Gassendi, *Syntagma*: Logic, bk. 2, ch. 3, as well as the more philosophical explorations in Gassendi, *Exercises Against the Aristotelians* 2.6.2–6. For the use of examples to reach conclusions about the deceptiveness of the senses and judgement, see Hobbes, *Human Nature* 2.5–9 (*Works*, 6: 5–8); Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, first part, ch. 11 (Buroker, 59–60); and Glanvill, *Scepsis scientifica* 10–16. On the particular example of pressing an eye, see Rohault, *System of Natural Philosophy* 1.2.14, 25, 34–5; and English philosopher Arthur Collier (1680–1732), *Clavis Universalis* 1.5, 2.1.

114.14 **dictates of reason]** possibly an allusion to Locke,[B] who uses this expression in his *Essay* 4.18.6, 10; 4.19.16; and in other works, such as *Two Treatises on Government*.

114.16 ***this house* and *that tree*]** At *THN* 1.4.2.18 Hume mentions 'mountains . . . houses . . . trees'. The identical examples are used in Berkeley,[B] *Dialogues* 1 (200) and *Principles* 1.4, 34.

114.16 **nothing but perceptions in the mind]** Compare similar theses in *THN* 1.4.2.1–52, 1.4.4.6, 14.4.6.4, Appx. 13; *Abstract* 28. Hume's explanations in *THN* of how we come to believe in the existence of external objects are not retained in *EHU*.

114.29 **caused by external objects]** Hume typically does not try to explain the causal conditions of impressions. See *THN* 1.3.5.2, 1.4.2, and 2.1.1.2. Hume may here be criticizing Locke's causal theory of perception. See Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.4.1, 2.8–10, 2.26.2, 4.11.

114.34 **dreams, madness]** Montaigne used dreams, madness, and related examples to reach similar conclusions in 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 672–9).

115.4 **without any foundation in reasoning]** Compare Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.125–8. He notes that neither the senses nor the mind is adequate to resolve this sceptical problem.

115.5 **veracity of the Supreme Being]** likely another allusion to Descartes,[B] *Meditations* 1 and 6 (*Philosophical Writings*, 2: 15, 54–62).

115.23 **most profound philosophy**] likely the philosophy of Berkeley,[B] here explored in terms of its opposition to Locke.[B]

115.26 **modern enquirers**] See *THN* 1.4.4 on 'modern philosophy'. Locke[B] was a prominent representative of the 'universally allowed' view, though he incorporated a role for primary qualities (*Essay* 2.8, 4.3.11–14). Secondary qualities, he says, 'are nothing in the Objects themselves, but Powers to produce various Sensations in us by their *primary Qualities*' (*Essay* 2.8.10). Antecedents are found in Galileo (e.g. *Assayer*, 309–12); Boyle (e.g. *Experiments and Considerations Touching Colours*, Hall edn., 10–12, 21, 74–5; *An Excursion about the Relative Nature of Physical Qualities* (*Works*, 3: 18–27)); and philosophers such as Descartes[B] and Gassendi. As Boyle notes, the thesis can be traced to the ancient atomists Democritus, Lucretius,[B] and Epicurus,[B] who distinguished between atoms and their sensory effects. For critics of this distinction, see the annotation below on 'primary qualities of extension and solidity'. Hume apparently thought that Berkeley[B] and Bayle[B] are exceptions to this 'universally allowed' position; see passages in their works cited below.

115.29 **external archetype**] Compare the similar treatment of external archetypes at *THN* 1.4.4.4, 14; and in Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.30.1, 4; 2.31.1–8; 2.32.26; 3.5.3; 3.6.43–7; 3.11.17; 4.4.5–8. See also Berkeley,[B] *Principles* 1.9, 45, 87, 90, 99; *Theory of Vision* 118; *Dialogues* 1–2. These philosophers and others before them used this terminology to refer to the *object* represented in perception, by contrast to the perception itself.

115.31 **primary qualities of extension and solidity**] Standard lists of spatio-temporal primary qualities included extension, shape, size, volume, position, and state of motion; standard lists of material primary qualities included mass, inertness, impenetrability, and solidity. See *THN* 1.4.2.12, 1.4.4.5–6 (primarily treating motion, extension, and solidity). Early modern formulations are in Galileo, *Assayer*, 308–12, and Boyle, *Origin of Forms and Qualities According to the Corpuscular Philosophy*, 'Considerations and Experiments . . . The Theoretical Part' 5–6—though much of the language was a scholastic inheritance. Influential debate in philosophy centred on Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.4, 2.8.7–26; and the response in Berkeley,[B] *Principles* 1.9–25, 61 (also *Dialogues* 1). Criticism of the distinction that impressed Hume is found in Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Pyrrho' [B]. See also Simon Foucher's probing criticisms of Malebranche[B] and Descartes[B] in *Critique of the Search for Truth*, Letter, first part, 5–7.

116.5 **scholastic notions**] These notions are either those of Aristotelian Scholastics, who held that general ideas (universals) are abstract entities and not individuals, or Platonist Scholastics, who held that general ideas are abstract individuals. 'Scholastics' is a broad category that includes Thomists, Scotists, Suarezians, etc.

n. 32 **Berkeley**[B]] Berkeley discusses primary and secondary qualities in *Principles of Human Knowledge* 1.9–25, 73, 87, 102 (2: 44–52, 72–3, 78–9, 85). In his Index to *ETSS* ('Berkeley'), Hume refers to Berkeley as 'a real Sceptic', reiterating that his

writings contain more than mere '*lessons* of scepticism'. At *THN* 1.4.2.50 Hume mentions 'extravagant sceptics'; he may there be referring to Berkeley, among others. For a similar and possibly even clearer lesson in scepticism, see Collier, *Clavis Universalis*.

n. 32 **Bayle[B] not excepted]** Bayle attacked the metaphysical systems of Descartes,[B] Malebranche,[B] Newton,[B] Locke,[B] and others. He argued that Descartes's and Malebranche's assumptions, for example, do not permit one to know that an external world exists. In an argument that anticipated Berkeley's views, Bayle contended (against 'the Cartesians') that the scepticism that has caused philosophers to doubt secondary properties should also lead them to doubt primary properties (*Dictionary*, 'Zeno of Elea' [H]). Bayle's articles on 'Pyrrho' and 'Spinoza' also influenced Hume (see letter of 26 Aug. 1737, to Michael Ramsay, in Tadeusz Kozanecki, 'Dawida Hume's nieznane listy w zbiorach Muzeum Czartoryskich (Polska)', *Archiwum Historii Filozofii i Myśli Spolecznej*, 9 (1963), 127–41, as published in Richard Popkin, 'So Hume did Read Berkeley'); and *THN* 1.4.5.22 and note.

n. 32 **title-page . . . against the sceptics]** Berkeley's book was entitled *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* in the first edition of 1710. In the edition of 1734 Berkeley[B] added the full title, which Hume here mentions: *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge. Wherein the Chief Causes of Error and Difficulty in the Sciences, with the Grounds of Scepticism, Atheism, and Irreligion, are Inquired Into*. The title page in this edition also reads *To which are added Three Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous, in Opposition to Scepticks and Atheists*. Berkeley often attacked free-thinking in religion. Some of Hume's discussion in n. 32 more closely matches the arguments in Berkeley's *Dialogues* than the arguments in the *Principles*.

n. 32 **in reality, merely sceptical]** The idea that Berkeley's writings are deeply sceptical, despite his contrary intentions, was not unique to Hume. Compare Baxter, *An Enquiry into the Nature of the Human Soul*, vol. 2, sect. 2 (especially 256–78).

00.00 **annihilate it]** Compare *THN* 1.2.3.15, 1.4.4.6. Gassendi (*Exercises Against the Aristotelians* 2.5.4) and Berkeley[B] (*Principles* 1.8–10) had used arguments similar to Hume's.

116.15 **unknown, inexplicable *something*]** In *THN* 1.1.6.1–2 Hume maintained that we have 'no idea of substance, distinct from that of a collection of particular qualities, nor have we any other meaning when we either talk or reason concerning it'. At *THN* 1.4.3.2–4 he examined the conditions under which the imagination generates the idea of an 'unintelligible something' called 'substance'.

116.16 **cause of our perceptions]** See *THN* 1.3.5.2 for a valuable passage on this topic. See also *THN* 1.2.5.26, 1.4.2.55, 1.4.5.29–32.

116.22 **the ideas of space and time]** See *THN* 1.2, 'Of the ideas of space and time' and the annotations immediately below.

116.28 **infinite divisibility]** See *THN* 1.2.1–4 for a detailed discussion. Doctrines of infinite divisibility descended from Aristotle[B] and were widely accepted prior to Hume. In *Abstract* 29 Hume says that philosophy and common sense have, with 'regard to the question of infinite divisibility . . . wag'd most cruel wars with each other'. For the intellectual background of his thinking, see Descartes,[B] *Principles* 1.26–7 (*Philosophical Writings*, 1: 201–2); Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, ch. 1 (Buroker, 230–2); Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Zeno of Elea' [F–I]; Rohault, *System of Natural Philosophy* 1.9.1–7, 1.21.2; Clarke,[B] *Works*, 2: 525; 3: 814, 849–50; Locke,[B] *Essay* 2.17; Berkeley,[B] *Principles* 1.47, 123, 128–32.

n. 33 **mathematical points]** indivisible points without extension or dimension (having no magnitude); they may appear in perceptual fields, but not as physical entities. Chambers noted that many authors denied 'the reality of atoms, together with that of mathematical points: An atom, say they, either has parts, or it has none: if it have none, it is a mere mathematical point: if it have, then do these parts also consist of others, and so to infinity' (*Cyclopædia*, 'atom').

This controversy pervaded many discussions in philosophy, science, and mathematics. Bayle[B] is a likely source for Hume's reflections, as several parallels are apparent in their presentations. Bayle considered what he thought to be the three *possible* accounts of the composition of extension: mathematical points, atoms (physical points or Epicurean atoms), and infinite divisibility. He argued that all three accounts are untenable. With regard to mathematical points, he says that 'several nothingnesses of extension joined together will never make an extension'. Bayle cites prevalent arguments in 'scholastical Philosophy' against the existence of these points (*Dictionary*, 'Zeno of Elea' [G]). (Some commentators find Berkeley[B] another likely source of Hume's reflections. See Bracken, 'On Some Points in Bayle, Berkeley, and Hume'.)

In *THN* 1.2.2.9–10; 1.2.3.14; 1.2.4.3–4, 15, 21, 33; 1.4.5.9, 14, Hume rejects infinite divisibility and discusses disputes about mathematical points in detail. The subject first appears in the section 'Of the infinite divisibility of space and time'. Several pages later Hume returns to mathematical and physical points in a section on 'Objections answer'd'.

117.29 **infinite number . . . passing in succession]** Other thinkers had commented on problems with the idea of an infinite number of real finite parts. See Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Zeno of Elea' [F–G], [I]; and Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, ch. 1 (Buroker, 231–3).

n. 34 **abstract or general ideas]** In Hume's work this controversy derives primarily from modern philosophy, especially from Locke[B] and Berkeley.[B] See Locke, *Essay* 2.11.7–10, 2.12.1, 2.32.6–8, 4.7.9; Berkeley, *Principles*, especially introduction 12–15 and 1.5–6 (see also introduction 6–11, 16–20; and 1.15, 18, 97–9, 126); *Theory of Vision* 122–5; and *Alciphron* 7.14 ff.; and the summary of the Locke–Berkeley dispute in Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, 'abstraction'. Abstract ideas had been discussed in

THN 1.1.7 ('Of abstract ideas'), where Hume refers favourably to 'Dr. *Berkeley*' in a context approximating that of n. 34. Berkeley's views are also discussed in *Letter from a Gentleman* 31.

118.18 **Pyrrhonism]** See the reports in Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.8–31 ff., 192–205; 2.18–21, 80–4).

118.21 **difficult, if not impossible, to refute]** In *Abstract* 27 Hume says that 'Philosophy wou'd render us entirely *Pyrrhonian*, were not nature too strong for it'. This comment appears to be related to his statement below (at *EHU* 12.23) that 'all human life must perish, were [Pyrrhonian] principles universally and steadily to prevail'. Compare the struggles with and concessions to Pyrrhonism in Mersenne, *La Vérité des sciences. Contre les sceptiques ou Pyrhoniens*, preface and 1.2.

118.25 **same condition as other mortals]** The hypothesis that some philosophers who propose suspension of judgement do not consistently act on what they profess, thereby subverting their own doctrines, dates at least from Aristotle,[B] who uses the example of the impossibility of suspending judgement when confronted with a precipice in *Metaphysics* 1008^{b}8–27. Bayle[B] uses this example, among others, to make substantially the same point (*Dictionary*, 'Pyrrho' [D]).

119.14 ***excessive* scepticism]** Contrast the discussion of 'mitigated scepticism' at *EHU* 12.24. Related themes about excessive scepticism and Pyrrhonism are found in Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, ch. 1 (Buroker, 228); and Mersenne, *La Vérité des sciences. Contre les sceptiques ou Pyrhoniens* 1.2, 11, 14.

119.22 **Pyrrhonian cannot expect . . . influence on the mind]** See ann. 118.21; *Letter from a Gentleman* 21, 24; and *THN* 1.4.1.7–11. In *Dialogues* 1.6–20 Hume discusses similar issues and mentions the related critical assessment of Pyrrhonism found in Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, First Discourse (Buroker, 7; Hume's translation differs): 'Pyrrhonism is not a sect of persons convinced of what they say, but a sect of liars.' The following works contain passages connected to Hume's theses: Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 9.62–4, 67–8; Cicero,[B] *Academica* 2.7.22–2.10.31, 2.19.61–2; Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Pyrrho', especially [B]; Baxter, *An Enquiry into the Nature of the Human Soul*, 2: 271–8.

120.3 ***mitigated* scepticism, or Academical philosophy]** See ann. 35.18 and 12.2 ff. Prior to Hume several philosophers had explored the contrast between academic scepticism (as moderate or mitigated) and excessive scepticism. See Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.220–33; Cicero,[B] *Academica* 2.10.32–2.11.33, 2.31.99–100, 2.32.103–4; Montaigne, 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 559–61, 571–2, 632–4); and Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, First Discourse (Buroker, 7–9). Among the academic sceptics—Arcesilaus (4th–3rd c. BC), Carneades (3rd–2nd c. BC), and Clitomachus (2nd c. BC), etc.—it is unclear who might have attracted Hume's attention; but Cicero is the most comprehensive source, and Hume knew his *Academica*.

120.34 **naturally sublime . . . sublime topics]** Theories of the sublime were of substantial importance in the 18th century. Hume has previously used 'sublime' in *EHU* without clear reference to this literature (see 2.6, 8.34–6, 10.17, 10.29, 11.9, 11.18), but the present statements may allude to it. In *EPM* 7.4 n. 37 Hume cites *On the Sublime*, long erroneously attributed to Longinus. Others who wrote substantial discourses on the sublime shortly before or after *EPM* include Shaftesbury, *Characteristics*, 'Soliloquy' 1.3, 2.2 (136, 157–69); Addison,[B] *Spectator* 412–18; Burke, *Philosophical Enquiry* 1.7; 3.27; 4.1, 5; and professor of philosophy and divinity Alexander Gerard (1728–95), *Essay on Taste*, a work Hume saw through the press. The latter contains footnote references to major texts of influence in the 18th century.

121.24 **abstract sciences or of demonstration]** See ann. 24.2 and n. 10 on demonstration.

121.36 ***squares of the other two sides***] the Pythagorean Theorem, perhaps first recorded in Euclid,[B] *Elements*.

122.8 **as clear and distinct an idea as its existence]** See ann. 24.2. Compare *THN* 1.2.4.11, 1.3.6.1. Cartesian metaphysics, especially a priori arguments for the existence of God, may be under inspection in this passage. Hume's claim also may put a new twist on an axiom in Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, fourth part, ch. 7 (Buroker, 250): '*At least possible existence is contained in the idea of everything we conceive clearly and distinctly* . . . [T]here can be no contradiction in an idea when it is clear and distinct.'

122.11 **sciences, properly so called]** sciences of quantity and number, esp. mathematical sciences or those capable of demonstrations from relations of ideas. See ann. 24.2–3.

122.14 **angel Gabriel]** See Luke 1: 19–26 (also Dan. 8: 16; 9: 21). In this context 'Gabriel' may be functioning as a substitute for the 'divine being' conceived in a priori reasoning about the existence of God.

n. 35 ***Ex nihilo, nihil fit***] Translation: 'Out of nothing comes nothing.' Lucretius[B] may be the earliest source for this aphorism. He says that 'nothing is ever by divine power produced from nothing' and that 'nothing can be created from nothing'. His Latin for the latter is 'nil posse creari de nilo'. *De rerum natura* 1, lines 150, 155–6. The Latin saying 'ex nihilo, nihil fit' was likely coined later. Many philosophers had accepted similar maxims in modern times, including Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.10.3–5, 8, 10, 18–19; and Descartes,[B] *Meditations* 3 (2: 28–9). Descartes's views on 'the efficacy of the Deity' are mentioned by Hume in n. 16; see ann. n. 16.

122.34 ***faith* and divine revelation]** Hume may be referring to fideism, which embraces faith and revelation while remaining sceptical of the capacity of reason and evidence from experience to support divinity or theology. From this perspective Pyrrhonism or any serious scepticism about the powers of human reason could be regarded as an ally rather than enemy of religious belief; see Hume's related

comments in *Dialogues* 1.5 and 12.33 on the connection between philosophical scepticism and religious belief (possibly there a parody of fideistic belief).

A remarkable example of fideistic recommendations (perhaps intended by the author as a critique of religious faith) is a 1741 pamphlet by English deist Henry Dodwell (d. 1784) entitled *Christianity not Founded on Argument* (issued anonymously and attacked by John Leland and other writers between 1743 and 1745). For examples of recurrent problems of faith and reason in modern philosophy and theology pertinent to Hume's comment, see Montaigne, 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', *Essays* 2.12 (Screech, 491–2, 499–502, 564–5); Pascal,[B] *Pensées* 41, 164, 220, 680 (Levi nos.); la Mothe Le Vayer, *De la vertu des payens*, 'De Pyrrhon' (esp. 305); Bayle,[B] *Dictionary*, 'Pyrrho' [C], including references to la Mothe Le Vayer; Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants* 2; Toland, *Christianity Not Mysterious* 3.4 (especially 145 ff.); Tindal, *Christianity as Old as the Creation* 2, 6–7, 12; Arnauld[B] and Nicole,[B] *Logic or the Art of Thinking* 12 (Buroker, 260–2) (one of several works by Arnauld treating these issues); Boyle, *Reconcileableness of Reason and Religion*, first part; Locke,[B] *Essay* 4.18.2–10; English mathematician and theologian Isaac Barrow (1630–77), 'Of the Vertue and Reasonableness of Faith' (*Works*, vol. 2, sermons 2 and 3); Archibald Campbell (1691–1756; St Andrews professor of divinity and ecclesiastical history), *The Necessity of Revelation* 3–8 (in response to Tindal); and Thomas Halyburton (1674–1712; professor of divinity, New College, St Andrews), *Natural Religion Insufficient, and Revealed Necessary, to Man's Happiness in his Present State* 4–6, 18 (pub. posthumously, 1714).

123.6 **school metaphysics]** Scholastic metaphysics. See ann. n. 1 on 'schoolmen'.

GLOSSARY

This Glossary treats potentially puzzling words and phrases in the text and notes of *EHU*. Synonyms are used rather than formal definitions whenever they are simpler and adequate to the task of eliminating confusion. If Hume provides a definition in one of his works, that definition is preferred.

Each term in the Glossary is followed by its section and paragraph locations. When a term is used in *EHU* more than ten times with the listed meaning, the designation *passim* is used to indicate frequent usage; section and paragraph numbers are not provided for these entries.

More than one meaning is listed for many terms. If a term is equivocal, the distinct meanings are segregated by numbers 1, 2, . . . , *n*, and the passages in Hume's text where the proper meaning occurs are listed separately under each number. More commonly, a term is not equivocal, but a family of related, English-language synonyms is helpful in the attempt to identify Hume's usage. Rather than dictate 'the meaning' by presenting only a single possibility, a range of the possible senses of the term is provided.

Verb (*vb.*), noun substantive (*n.*), and adjective forms (*adj.*) are distinguished if needed for clarity.

The Glossary and the Annotations are mutually supplementary. Words that occur only once in *EHU* and that are explained in the Annotations do not appear in the Glossary.

The following sources have been consulted: Nathan Bailey (ed.), *Dictionarium Britannicum* (1730; fac. Hildesheim: Olms, 1969); Ephraim Chambers (ed.), *Cyclopædia; or an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences* (London, 1728); Thomas Dyche and William Pardon, *A New General English Dictionary*, 3rd edn. (1740; fac. Hildesheim: Olms, 1972); John Harris, *Lexicon technicum* (London: 1704–10; fac. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1966); Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* (London, 1755), several editions; *Oxford English Dictionary*, primarily the second electronic edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Although editors of glossaries often cite such authoritative sources in the individual entries, these works have been used so extensively below that constant citation would be intrusive and excessive. For example, the *OED* and Dyche and Pardon have been consulted for almost every entry.

Searches have been made of many texts in the history of modern philosophy to ascertain how philosophers used these terms. The database in the Intelex PastMasters series has been particularly helpful. I have also profited from the work of other editors and owe a particular debt to David and Mary Norton, Edwin Curley, and P. H. Nidditch.

absurd: unfathomable; contrary to common sense; incomprehensible. 8.32; 10.16; 10.41; 12.2; 12.15; 12.18; 12.20.

adventures (at adventures): at random; on or by chance. 3.1; 3.10.

affect: given to; like. 1.14; 7.22.

amiable: worthy; estimable. 1.5.

aspect: perspective; appearance. 1.13; 12.6.

atheism, atheist: a classification indicating not only those who do not believe in God, but also those who believe in God in an unacceptably unorthodox manner. The term can also be applied to those who fail to believe in a critical theistic belief, such as divine providence or the afterlife. 10.25; n. 25; 12.1; n. 32.

at large: in detail. 10.25.

at this day: today. 10.41.

breast: seat of the passions and affections; mind. 10.1.

character: (1) *n*. trait or quality of a person. *passim*. (2) *n*. distinguished status or position. *passim*.

closet: a study or private room (**in the closet**: in private; in a study or private room). 11.23.

complexion: properties of a person; nature. n. 18.

complication: combination; joining or mixing. n. 20.

condition: social standing; class; position. 7.13; 10.19; 12.21; 12.23.

constitution: the states, qualities, dispositions, and principles that make up a living being's nature. 8.35.

deceitful: misleading (deceptive), but without intent to deceive. 1.12; 12.3; 12.22.

delicate: astute; perceptive. 1.8; 11.30.

delusive: deceptive. 10.22.

demonstration: a type of proof in which true conclusions known with certainty (undeniability) are derived from premisses that are true and certain (undeniable or self-evident). n. 10; 12.18; 12.27; 12.28.

destroy: counteract; neutralize; counter. *passim*.

disabuse: free from error; inform truly. 11.28.

durst: dared—past tense of *dare*. n. 25.

education: beliefs acquired by acculturation, exposure, or habituation; 'opinions or notions of things, to which we have been accustom'd from our infancy' (quoting *THN* 1.3.9.17). 8.11; 9.3; n. 20; 10.15; 12.4.

eminent: elevated. 10.22; 10.27.

engage: (1) gain; secure. 1.1; 8.35; 9.5; 10.22. (2) influence; persuade. 4.23; 8.18; 9.17; 10.10.

enow: enough. 8.36; 10.21.

fallacious: deceptive; misleading. 5.22; 11.25; 12.22.

fallaciousness: deceitfulness or false appearance. 12.5.

feign: imagine; invent. 5.10.

fine: subtle; refined. 1.13; 10.34.

fond: kind; tender. 5.18; 11.23; 12.24.

frame: construction; state. 8.35; 10.20.

gaoler: jailer. 8.19.

head: (1) topic; category. 2.2; 12.21. (2) heading. 1.13.

impudence: shameless boldness; foolishness. 10.17.

inconvenience: incongruity. 3.12.

indifferent: of no special importance; of small value or little consequence. 11.9.

indolence: insensibility or indifference (typically, towards pain). 1.12; 5.1.

indulgence: (1) admiration; appreciation. 5.1. (2) toleration. 11.29; 12.24.

insist: dwell; reflect at length. 4.16; 8.16; 11.16; 12.6; 12.21; 12.22.

interposition: intervention. n. 23.

issue: end; termination; discharge. 8.22; 10.32; 11.23.

libertine: free-thinker; one who holds free and loose opinions about religion. 5.1; 10.26.

medium: (1) the second proposition in a syllogism; ground or device for reaching conclusions. 4.16; n. 25; 11.22; 12.27. (2) mid-point; middle state. 4.21; 12.6.

moment: cause of action; determining influence. 4.13.

moral reasoning: reasoning that is factual; having a probable conclusion based on factual evidence. 4.18; 7.2; 12.29; 12.31.

natural philosophy: See ann. 1.1; 4.7; 7.2.

nay: term used to introduce a more precise or more correct statement than one previously made. 3.1; 4.23; 10.22.

œconomy: (1) organization, structure, or arrangement in the various parts of something (for example, the mind). 1.15; 8.34. (2) organization or internal constitution in the major subdivisions in nature (animal economy, vegetable economy, etc.). 8.14. (3) organization or management of a home or dwelling. 9.6. (4) in theology: method of divine government or administration of the world. 8.1.

open: clear. 1.3; 6.4.

parts: abilities; capacities. 1.13.

peculiar: special; distinctive. 3.13; 3.17; 5.12; 8.11.

penetration: the intellectual faculty or virtue of discovery by gaining access to the inner content of something. 1.13; 4.17; 7.27; n. 25.

physic: study or practice of medicine. 12.31.

pompous: magnificent; grand. 5.7.

positive: sure; self-certain. 1.13; 8.34; n. 22.

precedent: preceding. 2.6; n. 1.

pretence: rationale; pretension. 4.23; 5.1; 8.18; 8.26; 10.38; 11.24.

pretend: claim; maintain. 4.15; 7.21; n. 25. See also **pretension**.

pretension: (1) declaration; claim. 4.14; 7.10. (2) ambition; intention; aspiration. 1.15; 5.1; 10.17.

prickle: thing with which to prick. n. 25.

principle: cause; causal agent. *passim*.

prosecute: pursue. 2.6.

prosecution: the pursuit of. 4.3.

quickening: arousing; exciting. 5.16.

receive: accept as true or correct. n. 8; 8.25; 8.27; 10.20; 10.40; 12.18.

refined: (1) abstract. 5.1. (2) very subtle. 7.11; 10.24.

run over: considered; thought about. 3.3; 3.11; 12.34.

sacerdotal: priestly; belonging to or pertaining to a priest or the priestly office. 11.2.

scalenum: scalene triangle. 7.1; 12.15.

schools (*adj*. **school**): Scholastic philosophers or the subject-matter taught in medieval and early modern European universities. n. 18; 8.27; 12.34.

scope: purpose; aim. 10.24; 12.17.

scruple: (1) *n*. dispute; doubt. 4.16; 7.27; 8.19; 12.23; 12.25. (2) *vb*. doubt; question; question the truth of. n. 8; 10.29.

secret: concealed; undisclosed. (Does not require an intentional action.) *passim*.

secretly: privately. 3.1.

sentiment: See ann. 1.1.

several: distinct; separate. 1.9.

shadow out: represent by an imperfect image (for example, an icon, statue, or picture); symbolize. 5.16.

singly: singularly. 8.8.

specious: plausible and attractive; seemingly allowable and just. 8.9; 8.34; 10.38.

standish: inkstand (stand and dish). 8.20.

statuary: one who makes or carves images in wood or stone. 11.13.

still: regularly; consistently. 1.2.

subserviency: serviceableness, helpfulness, or usefulness toward an end. 1.8; 1.9.

suitable: conforming; corresponding. 8.34–6; 10.13; 11.3; 11.4; 11.16.

supine: careless; negligent. 5.1.

sympathy: a receptive and responsive sharing of another's opinion, distress, pleasure, or emotion. Often when Hume uses the word 'sympathy' he is pointing not to a sentiment, but to a psychological capacity to feel or arrive at sentiments. 3.11; 3.12; 3.13; 3.18.

taste: a properly cultivated faculty that equips people to reach good judgements and opinions regarding what is appropriate, excellent, beautiful, and the like. *passim*. See also ann. 1.1.

temper: temperament; mental constitution; disposition. 5.1; 8.7; n. 18; 8.30; 12.24.

timorous: careful; cautious. 12.4.

tract: series. 3.1.

try: test. 8.22; 11.6.

undistinguished: indistinct; confused. 12.24.

view: prospect. 1.1; 3.6; 6.3.

violence: intensity of influence; passionate quality; commanding effect. 3.11; 8.31; 12.24.

vulgarly: commonly; in common speech. n. 8.

EDITORIAL APPENDIX

EMENDATIONS AND SUBSTANTIVE VARIANTS

From 1748 until his death in 1776 Hume regularly modified *EHU* as he issued new editions. This Editorial Appendix explains and records all substantive variations between the editions of *EHU*—that is, changes in the exact wording during the evolution of the text from the 1748 edition to the 1777 edition.

Formal or 'accidental' changes are recorded only as necessary; they are recorded in full in an electronic edition to be published separately. These accidentals involve changes in typographic convention, spelling, and punctuation and are recorded in this Appendix whenever their history has a bearing on the editor's emendation of Hume's text. All changes of the copytext introduced by the editor, whether substantive or accidental, are recorded in this Appendix. Interested readers can therefore determine exactly how the critical text differs, both substantively and formally, from the copytext on which it has been based. They can also trace every substantive variation between the original text and every other edition authorized by Hume.

This Appendix is divided into three parts. Part 1 contains a brief explanation of the different kinds of changes made in the original text in order to construct the critical text. Part 2 lists unreported changes and describes systematic emendations. Part 3 is a combined register of non-systematic emendations and substantive variants. This classification of emendations as either *systematic* or *non-systematic* creates three (imperfectly distinguishable) forms of textual change, each reported separately:

1. Systematic changes of form made silently.
2. Systematic changes of form made collectively and reported in block.
3. Non-systematic changes of form and substance made individually and reported individually.

Part 2 of this Appendix (systematic changes handled as a group) treats (1) and (2). Part 3 (non-systematic changes handled individually) treats (3).

Systematic changes involve groups of identical or very similar changes that occur at more than one place. As a rough rule, systematic changes are of secondary importance in interpreting the text by comparison to non-systematic changes. All non-systematic emendations are reported in the register in the form of shaded entries. Full information about modifications made by Hume (or his printer) is supplied in the register for each non-systematic change. Reference numbers are to page (or note) and line in the text, not to section and paragraph.

PART 1

THE RATIONALE AND EVOLUTION OF THE CRITICAL TEXT

Hume prepared eleven editions of *EHU*. An editor must select one among these as the copytext, that is, the basic document for the construction of the edited critical text. As the copytext is progressively emended, it is converted into the critical text. In textual editing the resultant text normally resembles the copytext more than it resembles any other text of the same work, but a copytext is nothing more than a default adopted in the absence of countervailing evidence that the author changed his mind or that the copytext is faulty. In principle an eclectic critical text can deviate widely from the copytext.

No edition of a work in Hume's corpus is sufficiently flawless that corrections are unnecessary. Even if one were flawless by the standards operative at the time it was produced, printing practice evolved throughout Hume's lifetime in ways of which he was undoubtedly aware. An editor must be alert to this evolution as well as to Hume's judgements about it.

Choice and Treatment of the Copytext

Bibliographical scholars have often attached great weight to the difference between substantive and accidental variants. If it is known that an author carefully attended to the text in its progressive editions, it can be assumed that substantive changes are authorial. However, many changes in accidentals can often be attributed to the printer, or at least to some non-authorial source. From this perspective, it makes sense to make the first or some early edition the copytext. An editor is then free, in the absence of antithetic evidence, to incorporate changes in substantives while excluding changes in accidentals.

It is generally agreed that there are exceptions to this editorial strategy. The most important exception is a work that is known to have been extensively revised by the author in both substantives and accidentals. Since *EHU* fits this description, it qualifies as an exception. Hume took extraordinary care, exhibiting the commitment of a devoted hobbyist, in modifying his substantives, accidentals, and style. As the work matured, he removed archaic spellings and made many changes (see the register below) that it would be inappropriate for an editor to dismiss as if they had never transpired. Even if some changes in accidentals were made at the press, Hume had ample opportunity through the later editions to correct such changes. We can therefore assume that he sanctioned, or at least condoned, these modifications.

There is no reason in Hume's case to make a virtue of retaining accidentals that he clearly wished to alter. As most bibliographical scholars now recognize, the appropriate standard for scholarly modification of the text is evidence to warrant the changes made, not a theory that predetermines the changes.

The copytext for *EHU* (and for almost all titles in Hume's *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects* in the Clarendon Hume) is the 1772 edition. The general editors selected it for several reasons. This edition is the culmination of more than two decades of diligent attention by Hume, his printer, and even his booksellers. Hume's correspondence regarding the 1772 edition provides a record of his attention to and satisfaction with this edition that is unparalleled for any other edition of *ETSS*. He wrote to his printer, William Strahan, shortly before publication of this edition that 'my philosophical Pieces' have been 'perusd . . . carefully five times over'. During this same period he pointed to the meticulous and likely the final nature of the improvements he had made: 'This is the last time I shall probably take the pains of correcting that work, which is now brought to as great a degree of accuracy as I can attain.'[1] While in the midst of correcting the sheets of this edition, he wrote in a letter to Strahan one of his most memorable comments about his revisions:

> I thank you for your Corrections, which are very judicious; and you see that I follow them for the greatest part. I shall be obligd to you for continuing them as far as your Leizure will permit. For tho' I know, that a man might spend his whole Life in correcting one small Volume, and yet have inaccuracies in it, I think however that the fewer the better, and it is a great Amusement to me to pick them out gradually in every Edition.[2]

Immediately upon the publication of the 1772 edition Hume wrote to his bookseller, Thomas Cadell, that 'I have carefully perusd the Essays [*ETSS*], and find them very correct, with fewer Errors of the Press, than I almost ever saw in any book.'[3]

Despite his sense of finality and accuracy, Hume prepared additional corrections for the posthumously published edition of 1777. A compositor or proofreader apparently exercised more discretion in formal changes in this edition than in the editions corrected by Hume himself. The 1777 edition introduced various uses of accidentals and modest word shifts (chiefly commas, spelling, verb–adverb order, and subjunctive verb-forms) that are atypical of Hume's previous editions. The present critical edition gives greater credence to substantive changes in this posthumous 1777 edition than to its changes in accidentals, but a few changes of both types introduced inconsistencies or defects that are most plausibly attributed to the compositors. Hume did not live to see the proofs, and the compositor's changes could more easily have gone undetected than in an edition corrected by Hume himself.

Previous editions of the various works in *ETSS* by other editors have used the 1777 edition as the primary text. This edition was authorized by Hume before he died, and therefore has a strong claim as the copytext. It would have been the copytext had it not been for the following: First, Hume did not see the edition through the press, whereas in all previous editions he had the opportunity to oversee publication. Secondly, there appear to have been questionable modifications in the

[1] 25 Mar. 1771, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 239.

[2] 18 Sept. 1771, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 250. Strahan was sending to Hume up to five proof sheets, or eighty pages, per week during the period when the *History* was printed.

[3] 3 June 1772, to Thomas Cadell, *Letters*, 2: 262.

1777 edition, as well as one large and unexplained omission (see below). Thirdly, the 1772 is basically consistent with the 1777, and can easily be emended to incorporate Hume's authentic changes in 1777. On balance, then, the 1772 is a relatively easy choice.

However, the 1772, like all late editions, is not a perfect edition. Some deterioration in foreign language quotations and bibliographical references went uncorrected in all late editions, and many formal inconsistencies persisted throughout the editions. These problems are manageable and do not provide a sufficiently strong basis for overriding the ample evidence that Hume oversaw his later editions with as much or more care than the early editions. He was obviously pleased with his considerable investment in correcting the editions of *ETSS*, and justifiably so. Overall, the later editions are stylistically enriched and formally more accurate than the earlier editions.

The State of Hume's Editions

Despite the many corrections and improvements made in Hume's editions, anyone intimately familiar with the history of the changes made in *ETSS* might reasonably conclude that, in every edition in which these individual works were published, both its author and its printer were muddled and casual about a few formal matters—in particular about orthography, punctuation, capitalization, italics, case, and quotation marks. Neither Hume nor his printer was meticulous about the implementation of these conventions. Hume's authorized editions contained inconsistent forms from the beginning and through all later editions, and they have not in over 200 years been rendered consistent by subsequent editors.

Hume's editors have usually corrected blatant typographical errors while leaving uncorrected subtle errors (such as 'an' misprinted as 'any', commas inadvertently dropped, and plural forms incorrectly made singular), many formal inconsistencies, and many substantive errors (such as incorrect references in footnotes). In the present edition every effort has been made to examine these problems and to determine which derive from Hume and which do not. This task is not straightforward in the case of inconsistencies, because the rules governing conventions that Hume and his printer used were often poorly formulated or inconsistently implemented. For example, there was a rough rule that terms pertaining to gods (divinities) not be capitalized, whereas those pertaining to God (the Divine Being) be capitalized. But when terms like 'Deity', 'Divinity', 'Supreme Being', and the like occurred in the text, the rule was haphazardly followed.

Basic rules also sometimes came into conflict, requiring priority rules to settle the conflict, but the priority rules themselves were imprecise or *ad hoc*, and their implementation was relaxed and inconsistent. An instance is found in the unpolished rule to use abbreviations of Latin names in the footnotes, to be followed by a period as the stop and transition to a reference. A comma rather than a period was used when a name was not abbreviated; but, for several classical authors, more than one

abbreviation was used for the same person. There was apparent confusion in a few cases as to whether the form used (e.g. for LUCIAN and PLUTARCH) was or was not an abbreviation and, in the instance of a few Greek authors, was or was not a Latin form of a name. As a result, inconsistency appeared in the punctuation (both a period and a comma interchangeably used for the same function), and also inconsistency in the use of abbreviations.

There is good reason to believe that the printed texts are more inconsistent than Hume's manuscript practices, and therefore suspicion falls on the compositors as a major source of some, perhaps most, of the inconsistencies in the texts.[4] The evidence for this judgement is presented in Volume 1 of the critical edition (*A Treatise of Human Nature*), which reports on the results of a study of Hume's early correspondence and manuscript practices. This evidence supports the judgement that Hume had settled preferences that were not always reflected in his published texts.

This and related evidence indicates that compositorial preferences and publishing constraints introduced inconsistencies in *A Treatise of Human Nature* and that the introduction of inconsistencies through the practices and mistakes of compositors plays a similar role in the texts of *ETSS*. A conspicuous case is the 1758 edition, in which Hume and his printer shifted to the 'new spelling'—sometimes called the American spelling—in which the form '-or' displaced '-our' in the suffix of words like 'honour', 'endeavour', 'colour', and 'labour', and also in words such as 'flourish' and 'favourite'. Hume began to use this new spelling intermittently in his writing and rigidly in his editing—perhaps under the assumption that this practice would soon become the preferred style.[5]

Soon after this half-hearted adoption of these spellings (for a year or two), Hume switched back to the old spelling. The job of transformation was mismanaged

[4] Based on what is known about the journeyman printers of London, it was possible that distinct compositorial forms were introduced during the typesetting of a single work. The possibilities were increased when an edition of several works was under production. This hypothesis accounts for the pockets or sections of single works in *ETSS* in which different spellings are introduced, and thereafter vanish. Many examples suggest that compositors rather than Hume may have been the source of inconsistencies. The terms 'connexion' and 'connection' provide a representative example. Hume wrote and indexed using the spelling 'connexion', and in the copytext there are no occurrences of 'connection'. In the first editions of those works included in *ETSS* (those closest to his manuscripts) there are 122 occurrences of 'connexion' and only one of 'connection'. However, in two middle editions—the 1764 and 1768 editions—there are ten and twenty-one occurrences, respectively, of 'connection'. That Hume himself made these spelling changes is improbable. Similarly, in his own writing Hume virtually always uses 'choose' (not 'chuse') and 'show' (not 'shew'); but in the printed texts 'chuse' forms appear slightly more often than 'choose' forms, and 'shew' forms appear with almost the same frequency as 'show' forms (in the *Treatise* 'shew' forms are used in the overwhelming majority of cases). It appears, then, that compositors introduced multiple inconsistencies.

[5] See 20 June 1758, to Andrew Millar, *Letters*, 1: 282–3. Hume had already begun to initiate these changes in his *History* prior to the 1758 edition of *Essays and Treatises*, and he began in 1757 to use *both* '-or' *and* '-our' forms, virtually alternating them, in his correspondence. He did not use these new forms in his *Four Dissertations*, which appeared for sale in early Feb. 1757. In July 1758 Hume recommended 'this new Method of Spelling' to his printer for a new edition of his *History* (letter of July 1758, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 1: 283).

in the 1758 edition, introducing many inconsistencies. By late 1759 Hume was no longer using the new spelling in correspondence or in the preparation of new editions. Although these spellings were then aborted, several unique 1758 spellings slipped by unnoticed, and some remained all the way through the posthumous 1777 edition.

The 1758 edition is a starting-point for many changes of form, but most of the reforms that he had initiated were only gradually phased in over several subsequent editions. Some forms were never phased out completely, and many were retained in Hume's correspondence. Others (such as the 1758 spellings) were systematically terminated in a single edition. In introducing or allowing these stylistic changes, Hume showed a willingness to innovate in order to improve the appeal of the work, but many inconsistencies emerged in the process.

Hume failed throughout the long history of *ETSS* to eliminate various alternative spellings, which often persisted as inconsistencies in identical form in edition after edition. The retention of these inconsistencies across editions cannot be blamed entirely, or even primarily, on the compositor. Surviving fragments of proof, corrected in Hume's hand, and certain items of correspondence demonstrate that Hume was a reasonably careful editor and reader of proof. However, his concerns were primarily substantive and stylistic, with comparatively little attention paid to formal inconsistencies of the sort displayed below in the block reports (see pp. 221–5). For example, the several words that could be alternatively spelled with the prefixes 'in-' or 'en-' are more frequently spelled inconsistently than consistently throughout all of Hume's editions of *ETSS*.

Although Hume tended to be more consistent in his letters and manuscripts than in his published works, he is not consistent in those of the hand-written documents that have survived. Several words occur in inconsistent variant forms in both the manuscripts and the letters. For example, he tended to use 'to-morrow', 'tomorrow', and 'to morrow' almost indiscriminately; and he used 'dependance' and 'dependence' approximately an equal number of times in manuscripts.[6] Analysis of manuscripts and correspondence, then, will not answer all questions about Hume's preferences and practices.

Many conventions adopted in the printed texts derive from compositorial practices that Hume did not use in his writing but to which he presumably *consented*. The use of capitals joined with small capitals for persons and places (displacing the italics in the early editions of *EHU*, which were probably renderings of his manuscript underlining) is an obvious, if trivial, example. Hume may or may not have liked some of these practices. Some appear not to have been *his* practices and a few directly conflict with his known practices.

Accordingly, analysis of the copytext—as regards orthography, punctuation, upper and lower case, the use of italic, and the like, supplemented by the previously

[6] In the period 1748 to 1757 the suffixes '-ance' and '-ence' are each used with 'depend' exactly 50% of the time in the *ETSS* texts. In later years of the printed texts, and in the lifetime correspondence, there is a never resolved trend towards use of the '-ence' form.

mentioned evidence of Hume's manuscript practices—leads to the conclusion that many inconsistencies in the copytext were the joint product of the compositors' forms and preferences in collision with Hume's competing predilections. Faced with an unavoidable choice of preserving or eliminating these pointless inconsistencies, the editor of the present volume has usually found their elimination the reasonable course.

Editorial Modification of the Copytext

Perhaps the most critical problem facing an editor of Hume's texts in *ETSS* is how to use information about his practices and compositorial intervention in establishing the critical text. This Appendix cannot include a justification for each change of the copytext, but it is possible to provide a reasonably detailed general justification of what has been altered and why.

In a critical edition it is fruitless to produce a text that faithfully transcribes the errors and inconsistencies of the copytext. The elimination of errors and various inconsistencies, in light of a justified policy, is a fundamental objective. A text is critical if and only if one or more editors has exercised principled and systematic judgement about each word and every form in the text, in light of all the evidence that can be marshalled. The general guideline used by the present editor has been to follow the copytext unless an authoritative practice, bona fide error, inconsistency, or instruction from Hume to his printer or bookseller warrants deviation. The justifying conditions for deviations from the copytext are authoritativeness, removal of inconsistency, and elimination of error.

So far as substantive changes are concerned, the editing is exceptionally conservative. Hard choices occasionally had to be made when the editor was not satisfied that a single most defensible reading could be determined; but these cases were few in number. Also rare were errors (usually misprints) needing correction. Errors in Hume's texts are usually typographical and conspicuous, but some are more subtle, and editorial verdicts of error may generate debatable changes. For example, each of Hume's direct quotations has been checked against both the first edition of his text and against the (or a principal) published source of the work cited. Wherever it is known which source or edition Hume used, or an entirely reliable source with the proper forms is available, and it is determined that after Hume's first edition the passage became corrupt, then the text has been corrected to the wording or forms in Hume's first (or his otherwise most correct) edition. That is, Hume's text is restored to the forms *he used* in his original transcription of the passage. Only if Hume's quotation in all of his editions deprived the passage of its sense or made an unintelligible formal error was it restored to a form other than that found in Hume's editions.

Inconsistencies in Hume's text, by contrast to errors, presented a more challenging set of issues. In some cases compelling evidence to underwrite a decision has been found. For example, the 1777 edition changes one 1772 copytext use of 'connexion' to 'connection'. The authority of the later edition might seem to be a reason to

emend the text; but, as we saw previously, Hume does not use the spelling 'connection' and all other spellings in the 1777 edition were 'connexion'. The 1777 edition change is almost certainly a compositor's slip that went undetected in the proofreading, which occurred after Hume was dead. Denying authority to the 1777 edition in this instance is not a difficult decision.

Another uncomplicated decision is changing inconsistent spelling, punctuation, italicization, case, and the like when editions both before and after the copytext contain consistent forms that are compatible with the mainstream usage in the copytext. For example, in the full 1772 copytext of *ETSS* 'ARRIAN' is only once (mis)printed 'ARIAN' (possibly a compositor's confusion of the historian with the heresy mentioned in *NHR*), and 'PLUTARCH' in small capitals is the clear rule for a name, not 'Plutarch', as it once appears. In *ETSS* there are dozens of these simple and easily removable inconsistencies.

In numerous other cases, however, the evidence for competing alternatives less conclusively points to a single form. For example, in the critical text 'above-mentioned' has displaced 'above mentioned' in six places. There were exactly six occurrences of each form in the copytext, and there was a slight trend across all editions of *ETSS* away from the hyphenated form that the editor has selected. However, the hyphenated form 'above-mentioned' is always used in the *Treatise*, the *Abstract*, and Hume's correspondence (thirty occurrences, always consistent). Evidence external to the copytext, then, can become a relevant consideration if the evidence internal to it and to all of the complete editions of *ETSS* is inconclusive. By contrast, in the case of 'beforehand' and 'before-hand' the evidence is also offsetting and is complicated by the occurrence of printed right-margin hyphens, which can be read either way. A slight trend exists in *ETSS* editions favouring the hyphen, and there is no external evidence against this trend. Therefore, evidence internal to *ETSS* proved decisive. (The principled basis for these judgements is discussed in the next section.)

In these cases no firm rule can be applied with a strong degree of confidence. Hume's practices were intertwined with the practices of a rotating set of compositors who brought different conventions to their work. Practices were modified as *ETSS* matured, so that Hume's manuscript habits and preferences became intermixed with print-shop practices. The text became the product of the writing–bookselling industry. It is not surprising that inconsistencies emerged from this process, especially if those in charge were lackadaisical in correcting the new editions. Not to be forgotten is that Hume and his bookseller brought out new editions rapidly, sometimes within a few months of the previous edition.

Principles for the Elimination of Inconsistencies

Faced with multiple problems of inconsistency, an editor might act on one or more of the following five principles, each of which has been selectively employed in editing the work in this volume.

1. Reproduce inconsistencies wherever a sufficient reason exists for retaining them.
2. Eliminate inconsistencies by following Hume's preferred practices (as determined by manuscripts, correspondence, and his explicit directions).
3. Eliminate inconsistencies by following the dominant practices in the copytext (including the 1772 *Essays* in *ETSS*).
4. Eliminate inconsistencies by following the dominant practices across all (or perhaps only the late) lifetime editions of *ETSS* (including the *Essays* portion of *ETSS*).
5. Eliminate inconsistencies by following the dominant practices across all of Hume's published lifetime editions, including the *Treatise* and authorized posthumous publications that he prepared for the press.

Principle 1 has been used rarely in this volume, because only infrequently has there been a sufficient reason for retaining an inconsistency. However, a few candidates for the designation 'inconsistency' that might have been altered by the editor have not been altered in this edition. For example, Hume's apparently inconsistent capitalization of the word 'deity' has been retained. Either there was insufficient evidence in Hume's text to determine a proper form or there was some reason for retaining the copytext form. In every case there is a reasonable presumption that Hume intentionally permitted the inconsistency, as a form of style, distinct expression, or emphasis.

Two simple 'inconsistencies' are Hume's uses of (1) 'enough' and 'enow' (plural of 'enough') and (2) 'oft' and 'often'. Here we have two different words, not a mere spelling variation. Over the years of the works comprising *ETSS* Hume progressively changed 'oft' to 'often' in the majority of cases, but left the conversion incomplete; 'enough' is also his choice over the Scotticism 'enow'. These and other inconsistencies in the text might be considered candidates for emendation by some editors, but the present editor believes that emendation is inappropriate. There is no safe course for rendering the text consistent without possible loss of meaning, expression, or emphasis. These 'inconsistencies' are arguably not real inconsistencies, only different uses of a family of terms. Similarly, in formal matters of punctuation, an alternative usage may not constitute an inconsistency. For example, a series of words linked in one place by a comma and conjunction may be linked, in a different but parallel place, by a semi-colon and conjunction. These apparent inconsistencies have been allowed to stand.

Principle 2 has been used more often than principle 1, but still only rarely. Too little is known, in the typical situation, about Hume's preferences apart from the evidence he left in his editions. He prepared nine or more editions of each text in *ETSS* over a period of almost thirty years, possibly himself producing the very inconsistency that might be in question.

Principles 3 and 4, by contrast to 1 and 2, have been used extensively in this volume, and principle 5 has served as a way of helping decide whether (in various contexts) use of principle 1, principle 3, or principle 4 was the best choice.

Depending on the particular decision and the state of the evidence, there is much to be said for each of these five principles. However, no one principle can be allowed to stand authoritatively over the others, as examination of each principle will show. Principle 2, although attractive, has many limitations. Hume's manuscript and correspondence practices were in pertinent respects sometimes sloppy, and even incorrect or otherwise unacceptable for the texts in *ETSS*. For instance, in correspondence Hume normally did not underline (mark for italic) the titles, nor did Hume underline with complete consistency in the manuscripts he prepared for publication. Further, Hume typically capitalized substantives and was doing so beyond the point his publisher or printer stopped the practice. Two decades after the time the practice was generally abandoned, Hume was still writing to his publisher using such capitalization, as he did in the manuscript of 'My Own Life' within the year of his death. A rule requiring a change in the critical edition to the capitalized substantives used in the original manuscript would be an unacceptable editorial policy, especially given that they were never capitalized in print in some of the works in *ETSS*. Unqualified acceptance of principle 2, then, is unacceptable.

Principles 3–5 are reasonable but not absolute principles. The copytext is the touchstone by which the forms of the critical text are to be determined. But an unqualified reliance on any one of these three principles will also give rise to problems. For example, some forms are handled consistently (and identically) in the 1768 and the 1777 (and often other) editions, but inconsistently in the copytext. Only slavish adherence to a copytext principle would allow principle 3 to override principle 4 in some of these cases. On a few occasions the copytext and the final 1777 edition are the only inconsistent texts in the full set of editions—for example, this is the case in their uses of both 'self love' and 'self-love' and 'full grown' and 'full-grown'. This finding does not serve as an argument against the 1772 edition as copytext, because every edition contains some inconsistencies that are handled consistently in all the other editions.

To conclude, no one of the five above principles can be applied mechanically to override the others. Each principle supplies a prima facie good reason for making a change in some cases, but each may be inappropriately applied in other cases, and therefore be overridden by one of the other principles. There are also reasons for changing the text beyond those formulated in principles 1–5. These reasons include Hume's explicit instructions in a letter to his printer, information about eighteenth-century compositorial practices and forms of orthography and punctuation, and information about correct French accents.

Putting the Principles into Editorial Practice

More specific considerations than these general principles also play a role in textual editing and in decisions about emendation. The following considerations can be regarded as specifications of the above five principles.

1. If the copytext is internally consistent, it has been followed even if there is good

evidence that Hume's manuscript or correspondence practices were different. For example, substantives are not capitalized, although, as observed earlier, it was Hume's practice to use capitals. An inconsistency in the copytext signals the need for a modification, but if there is no inconsistency, there is no need for recourse to evidence drawn from manuscripts or correspondence. The copytext has also generally been followed even if there is good evidence that earlier editions used different practices.

2. If the copytext is not consistent, and there is adequate evidence of Hume's preference (or standard forms in manuscripts), correspondence, explicit directions, or trends across the 1748 to 1777 editions, then Hume's apparent practice has been allowed to override what seems to have been the compositor's inconsistently implemented preference. 'Choose', 'show', and 'connexion' have already been cited as examples.

3. If the copytext is not consistent and Hume's preferences are not known or are not determinative, then one of the following three conditions has been allowed to prevail:

(*a*) the predominant usage in the copytext, or
(*b*) a trend favouring a certain change across the *ETSS* editions from 1748 to 1777, or
(*c*) the dominant practice of Hume's lifetime and authorized posthumous writings.

(In effect, if principles 1 and 2 proved inappropriate, then either principle 3 or principle 4, supplemented by principle 5, was implemented.)

Regarding condition (*a*), the specific forms of authority underwriting editorial changes made on the basis of evidence entirely internal to the copytext include the following:

(i) An entry in the table of contents in the front matter of the copytext contains a form that justified an emendation in the text or notes. For example, capitalization on titles of sections in the text could serve to justify making the headings consistent with the Contents and with the headings used in other works in *ETSS*.
(ii) An entry in the Index in the endmatter of the copytext sometimes contains a form that justifies an emendation in the text or notes. For example, the word 'Impostor' (under 'Alexander the Impostor', at *EHU* 10.22–3) was important for a change of wording that was further supported by the text of other editions.
(iii) The operative rules of grammar, spelling, punctuation, and style in the copytext justifies the emendation.

Regarding conditions (*b*) and (*c*), the practices of *ETSS* have virtually always taken precedence over practices found in other works by Hume. The *Essays*, which comprise one-half of *ETSS*, have proved to be as important in many cases as the four treatises (including *EHU*) in the other half. Trends towards a particular

usage or practice that held across the many editions of *ETSS* have been accepted as recommendations of that usage or practice. Hume's later correspondence proved to be less important, and the *Treatise* and the early correspondence far less important, although all of these materials have been consulted in making editorial decisions.

The rules governing a dominant practice in the editions of *ETSS* have occasionally been used to repair an inconsistency, even if the inconsistency appears in most or all editions. For example, 'Roman Catholics' appeared in three inconsistent forms of upper and lower case in the copytext. By invoking more than one of the rules used throughout the middle and later editions, the single predominant form 'Roman Catholics' is used in the present volume. Some parallel inconsistencies of upper and lower case occurred throughout Hume's authorized editions. These changes do not affect the meaning of the sentences in which they occur.

In a few cases a practice that was generally consistent in early or early-and-middle editions became inconsistent in later editions. In these cases the practices in the early or middle editions have sometimes been determinative. The 1768 edition (and, to a lesser extent the 1767) has played a particularly valuable role in decisions in this volume. Hume evidently made changes (inadvertently, perhaps) for the 1770 edition based not on a copy of the 1768 edition, but rather on a copy of the 1764 edition. Many changes introduced in 1767 and 1768 were thereby lost and never recovered. (See the Introduction to this volume.) This loss was significant, because an effort was apparently undertaken in the 1768 edition to render several practices consistent that both antecedently and subsequently were always inconsistent.

Practices or changes in the 1777 edition have been allowed to override the copytext only if there is an adequate basis for believing that the 1777 edition more consistently follows the already established rules or practices of the editions. The 1777 edition must remove an inconsistency or follow an externally established point of style in order to be determinative for the critical edition. Without using such standards a 1777 change might simply rest on a printer's poor choice made after Hume's death. As an example of how the 1777 edition occasionally improves consistency, the word 'resolvable' was consistently so spelled only in the 1777 edition, and this spelling has been adopted in the critical text, replacing the inconsistent spelling in the copytext.

However, the 1777 edition also introduced changes that are inconsistent with the practices of previous editions, occasionally causing new internal inconsistencies. These forms in the 1777 edition have not been followed. The general editorial practice has been to incorporate an accidental variant from the 1777 edition only if it corrected a mistake or if, upon a computer search, it was demonstrated that the 1777 form eliminated inconsistencies or deviant forms in the copytext or followed Hume's general lines of change in previous editions. In no case were the accidentals of the 1777 edition accepted merely because they were later accidentals. In this respect the 1777 edition has no special authority.

A *substantive* change in the 1777 edition, by contrast, has been incorporated unless it was a corruption of the copytext. (The register below records all accepted changes

in substantives, as well as those that were not accepted.) One prominent exception to this general rule has been allowed. The final fifteen paragraphs of Section 3 (beginning near the end of par. 3, as marked on the page) did not appear in the 1777 edition. This material was present in all ten editions from 1748 to 1772, and the reason for its omission in 1777 is unknown. An internal change within the surviving text of 1777 indicates that the change was intentional (though the wording of this change was botched during the repair in 1777 and has been perpetuated in all modern editions). This change may have been Hume's own. None the less, the material from the 1772 copytext is retained in the present edition and placed in brackets with an annotation explaining its omission in 1777. This way of handling the text accords the 1777 a suitable but not undue authority; that is, it notes precisely how the 1777 differs without relegating the material in the copytext to the position of a mere editorial appendix in the endmatter of the present volume.

On the one hand, even if Hume ordered this material to be deleted, his decision might have been an impulsive overreaction to the difficulty of the material made while he was ill and in the last stages of life. On the other hand, Hume may have had very good reason for insisting on the omission of these paragraphs. This problem cannot now be resolved; the material can simply be displayed for readers to use as they see fit. Part of the reason for placing the material in brackets is to alert readers that it may justifiably be regarded *either* as an editor's supplement to Section 3 (using the text of the 1777 edition as the standard) *or* as an integrally related set of paragraphs (as judged by the editions from 1748 to 1772). This placement is intended neither as an interpretation of Hume's text nor as a representation of the most satisfactory way of understanding the 1777 omission. The goal is to leave the reader free to draw his or her own conclusions about the purpose and significance of these fifteen paragraphs.

4. On rare occasions an item or form used in one or more editions pre-dating the copytext has been adopted, even if there was no corresponding inconsistency in the copytext. Very occasionally an early accidental justified a change. Less rarely, a substantive error such as an incorrect book, chapter, or page number has been corrected by reference to an earlier edition. The accuracy of the first edition of each work in *ETSS* was examined with particular care. These original editions were valuable for correcting both substantive and formal mistakes that had crept into the footnotes of the later editions.

It is not known whether Hume checked the originals of quoted material after his initial transcriptions in the manuscripts, but it seems unlikely, on the available evidence, that his later editions were checked against the originals from which he was quoting. In some cases the material in his notes degenerated significantly in both substance and in form. To cite but one type of example, book numbers in three different works cited in Hume's notes (one each in *EHU*, *EPM*, and *NHR*) degenerate from book 4, book 6, and book 20 in the early editions (all correct citations) to (respectively) book 5, book 11, and book 15. This deterioration renders Hume's notes functionally worthless, as the location in the cited source is incorrect and the passage impossible to locate without reading the entire work.

5. Finally, modernization has not been permitted. However, a few unique instances that did not conform well to any of the above principles were encountered. Throughout the process of detecting inconsistencies and emending the text the editor has had to struggle with uncertainty and borderline cases. For example, it often had to be determined whether a word was being used or mentioned by Hume. He clearly meant to distinguish use and mention, and the normal but not uniform practice in his published writings is to print mentioned words in italic. There is good evidence that Hume underlined these mentioned words in his manuscripts to the extent he thought to do so. Accordingly, wherever the editor discovered words that are mentioned but printed in roman type, these words have been modified to italic type in the critical text to bring them within Hume's customary practice. In a few instances the editor could not be certain whether an apparent case of mentioning qualified as such. Faced with inconclusive evidence as to practices or meanings, the editor has not intervened to make a change, even if he believes that one form is the best rendering of the text.

The text of the critical edition will, with the above-mentioned modifications, prove more accurate for electronic searching than any edition previously published, including presently available electronic texts (all of which currently perpetuate many of the inconsistencies discussed above). Scholarship on Hume has been and will continue to be facilitated by text-based searching. If the inconsistencies had not been eliminated in this edition, many searches would be so inaccurate as to be useless, even with sophisticated search programs. The resulting text has also, by virtue of the emendations, been brought more in line with Hume's manuscript practices, known intentions, and explicit instructions to his printer. If we further assume that both the author and the printer preferred consistency to inconsistency in the formal presentation of the text, the presentation has been brought more closely in line with this preference.

These points are worth belabouring because the attitude persists in many quarters that Hume's text is like an antique piece of furniture, whose every dent and scratch is to be protected against those who would improve its appearance, the defacement having become an integral part of the relic. Perhaps this is a good model for protecting hardwood masterpieces, but it is an inadequate conception of those artefacts we call literary masterpieces, and it is a conception the general editors of the critical edition reject. None the less, every effort has been extended to alter the text as infrequently as is permitted by faithfulness to the principles and other guidelines discussed in Part 1 of this Editorial Appendix and in the Note on the Text.

PART 2

SYSTEMATIC CHANGES

As a general rule, all instances of modifications of the copytext are reported by page and line number, either in block reports in the last half of Part 2 or in the register in

Part 3. Exceptions to this general rule are changes made silently. These largely typographical changes will be discussed first.

Systematic Changes of Form Made Silently

Changes of form that are made silently are limited to the following:

1. Single quotation marks have sometimes been exchanged for double quotation marks, or vice versa, thereby silently correcting what appears to have been an oversight or printing error.

2. No effort has been made to retain certain typographical publishing and formal practices that were commonly used in the eighteenth century. Practices eliminated include:

(*a*) Pointing ('.') following section and part titles.
(*b*) The long 's' ('ſ').
(*c*) Catchwords.
(*d*) Booksellers' advertisements (announcements).
(*e*) Typographical or decorative ornaments.
(*f*) Roman numbers (here presented as arabic).
(*g*) Unnumbered note markers, including asterisks (*), daggers (†), double daggers (‡), and the like.
(*h*) Inverted commas or quotation marks running along the margin.
(*i*) Concluding a work or volume with 'FINIS'.

3. Footnote markers have been placed to the right, rather than to the left, of punctuation marks, reversing the practice in the copytext. Whereas the copytext uses both footnotes and endnotes, the critical text prints all notes as footnotes, precisely as Hume and his printer had done in every edition until 1770.[7] These footnotes are numbered consecutively, by individual work, whereas Hume and his printer had used asterisks, daggers, and the like.

4. Accents on letters have occasionally been added or deleted. For example, some accents in French omitted by Hume or by his compositor in some editions have been restored on the basis of one or more editions of Hume's works other than the copytext. In contrast, the a grave (à)—commonly, but not always, used in *ETSS* when printing the Latin terms 'a priori' and 'a posteriori'—has been removed.

5. This edition continues the practice of capitalizing whole words (cap/small-cap combinations) in the beginning line of all works and their unique component parts and all sections in a book-length work (the two *Enquiries* only, in the case of *ETSS*). However, the size of the first letter, normally a two-line capital, has been disregarded. (See change 7 below for a related and abandoned practice.)

6. In his notes Hume occasionally neglected to place a non-indented, direct quo-

[7] Hume stated a preference for footnotes over endnotes in a letter to his printer, while commenting on Gibbon's *History*: "All these Authorities ought only to be printed at the Margin or the Bottom of the Page." 8 Apr. 1776, to William Strahan, *Letters*, 2: 313.

tation in either quotation marks or in italics, although it was his general practice to use one of these two forms to distinguish quotations. Quotation marks have been added in only one such case in *EHU*. This change is reported in block below. Because it was not Hume's practice to use any form of notification to distinguish quoted Greek from anonymous maxims and the like, direct quotation in Greek remains unchanged.

7. The typographical practice of capitalizing whole words in introducing footnotes was executed with remarkable inconsistency throughout *ETSS* and has been discontinued.

8. The practice of capitalizing in full the first word under each letter in Hume's Index has been continued, although some of the words capitalized in the critical edition were not capitalized in the copytext or in any other edition. This comprehensive Index to *ETSS* has been divided into the proper entries for the present volume so that only the entries for *EHU* are included. The remaining entries in the Index are to be found in other volumes of the critical edition. Numbering of sections and paragraphs, capitalization, and punctuation has been systematically adapted and made consistent; and all errors have been corrected. In the register three forms in Hume's Indexes have not been considered variants to be reported: (1) page numbers, (2) commas to set off entries, and (3) lines of the form '——' used to repeat an entry found on an immediately previous line. In addition, no report is made of new capitals for the opening entries under several letters, as the abridging of Hume's comprehensive Index of *ETSS* required. (The function of the capitalization practices in the Index *other than* for opening entries under each letter is not well understood. It may have been Hume's way of giving emphasis, as it often is elsewhere.)

Systematic Changes of Form Reported in Block

Systematic changes of form reported in block derive from formal inconsistencies eliminated from the copytext. The resulting emendations have no effect on substantive meaning. These emendations are of interest principally for the information they convey about the conventions accepted by Hume or his printer. They are classified under six headings:

1. Orthography (spelling and abbreviation).
2. Punctuation.
3. Italic and roman type.
4. Upper and lower case.
5. Errors in typography (misprints).
6. Errors in Greek (mistranscriptions).

Displacements of forms in the copytext (items 1–4) are reported using the abbreviation *displ*. (for 'displaces'). Misprints in the copytext (item 5) are reported using the abbreviation *mispr*. (for 'misprinted'). Any apparent misprint that conceivably might be classified as a substantive change is reported in the register, rather than in

this block form. Displacements not resulting from the elimination of an inconsistency in the copytext are reported in the register, not in block. Page and line numbers or footnote numbers are supplied for each change.

1. Orthography

Inconsistent orthography has been eliminated by adopting the principal forms in the copytext, other *ETSS* editions, and other publications and manuscripts, as explained in Part 1 of this Appendix.

Primary Spelling or Abbreviation Displaces Secondary Spelling or Abbreviation. (1) Lucian. *displ.* Luciani: n. 28, n. 29. (2) Section *displ.* Sect.: n. 7.2.

Spelling or Nomenclature Modified: Proper Names and Titles. (1) Herault *displ.* Heraut: n. 25.32. (2) Mademoiselle Le *displ.* Madamoiselle le: n. 25.21. (3) Mademoiselle Thibault *displ.* Madamoiselle Thibaut: n. 25.38. (4) Arnauld *displ.* Arnaud: n. 25.74.

Spelling Modified: Other than Proper Names and Titles. (1) analyze *displ.* analyse: 14.29. (2) authorized *displ.* authorised: Advert.13, 108.32. (3) Biasses *displ.* Byasses: n. 20.28. (4) choos(e)(s) *displ.* chus(e)(s): 18.17, 19.13, 42.25, 69.11, 72.13, 72.14. (5) compleat *displ.* complete: 51.26. (6) (un)controul(ed) *displ.* (un)control(l)(ed): 35.15, 52.29, 60.9, 104.34. (7) counterpoise *displ.* counterpoize: 86.8. (8) dependence *displ.* dependance: 68.5. (9) desert *displ.* desart: 25.12. (10) ellipsis *displ.* elipsis: 49.6. (11) encrease(s) *displ.* increase(s): 21.20, 117.13. (12) enforces *displ.* inforces: 41.22. (13) foretel *displ.* foretell: 69.35. (14) governor *displ.* governour: 105.24. (15) incontestable *displ.* uncontestable: n. 25.69. (16) isosceles *displ.* isoceles: 49.6, 116.3. (17) landscape *displ.* landskip: 13.13. (18) nowise *displ.* no wise: 21.31. (19) possessed *displ.* possest: 41.28. (20) recall *displ.* recal: 43.31. (21) relicts *displ.* reliques: 43.19, 43.22. (22) show(n)(ing) *displ.* shew(n)(ing): 9.40, 19.31, 27.19, 28.29, 30.36, 32.18, n. 8.35, 64.24, 70.8, n. 18.19, 72.27, 88.5, 93.3, 108.28, 108.29, 119.10, 120.24. (23) soever *displ.* so ever: 8.12. (24) subtract(ion) *displ.* substract(ion): 97.2, 97.5. (25) surpriz(es)(ing) *displ.* surpris(es)(ing): 35.27, 55.31, 60.3. (26) suspence *displ.* suspense: 35.19. (27) undisputably *displ.* indisputably: n. 25.19.

'A' Displaces 'An' before Certain U-Words and H-Words. In the 1772 copytext (of *ETSS*) 'a' and 'an' were inconsistently employed before three word-forms beginning with the letters 'u' and 'h': 'uniform(ity)', 'utility', and 'hundred'. The 1777 edition corrected *all but one* of these inconsistencies in favour of 'a'. The 1777 edition rule has been followed throughout this volume, eventuating in changes at 32.1, 65.10, 65.37, 66.12, 67.29, 68.35, 84.23, 87.11, and 87.12.[8]

[8] The changes made in 1777 did not extend to u-words and h-words that *consistently* used 'an' in the copytext. The use of 'an' with these words has not been altered. These words (in *ETSS*) include 'Helen', 'hypothesis', 'hyperbola', 'hour', 'harangue', 'heroic', 'historical', 'honest', 'universal', 'upward', 'uninterrupted', 'unpardonable', 'uncertainty', 'unknown', 'unavoidable',

Hyphenated Word Displaces Unhyphenated Form. (1) above-mentioned *displ.* above mentioned: 14.3, 31.14, 71.18, 73.2, 75.5. (2) before-hand *displ.* beforehand: 84.3, 104.37.

Unhyphenated Form Displaces Hyphenated Word. good sense *displ.* good-sense: 88.9.

2. Punctuation

Inconsistent punctuation has been eliminated by adopting the principal usage in the copytext, the other *ETSS* editions, and other publications and manuscripts, as explained in Part 1 of this Appendix. The bulk of the changes occur in the notes, which appear to have been hastily prepared or set and never carefully checked. The *ETSS* rule was to use a comma after an unabbreviated name and a period (not followed by a comma) after an abbreviated name. Correction of inconsistencies of punctuation under this rule has sometimes involved a prior editorial decision about inconsistency of abbreviation.

Comma or Period Added before a Title or after an Author in the Notes. (1) Cicero,: n. 9.10. (2) account, in vita Vesp.: n. 24. (3) Lucian.: n. 28, n. 29.

Period Displaces Comma after an Author in the Notes. Plutarch. n. 21.

Comma after Ordinal Term Displaces Period or Semicolon. (1) First, or *first*,: 20.14, 52.25. (2) *Secondly*,: 15.3, 20.31, 88.18. (3) *Thirdly*,: 90.4.

Line Added in the Index for the Repetition of an Indexed Term. before one: 309 (under 'Miracles').

3. Italic and Roman

Inconsistent use of italic and roman type has been eliminated by adopting the principal usage in the copytext, other *ETSS* editions, and other publications and manuscripts, as explained in Part 1 of this Appendix. Roman forms sometimes replace italic equivalents, and vice versa. Most of these inconsistencies consist of small oversights, such as incorrectly italicizing a question mark. Other cases involve a larger inconsistency of presentation, such as failing to italicize a question or a statement in cases typically italicized in *ETSS*. The normal but not uniform practice of Hume's writings was to print mentioned words or terms in italic. This rule has been followed if and only if the context is undoubtedly one of mentioning rather than using.

Italics Removed from Latin Wording in the Notes. in vita: n. 24.

Italics Removed from Punctuation and Word in the Text. (1) italics removed from a question mark: 59.31, 117.16. (2) religion: 98.32, 99.23.

'unconquerable', 'uneasiness', 'unlimited', 'unreserved', 'undisputed', 'utter', 'unusual', 'unequal', 'undisturbed', 'unjust', 'ultimate', 'usurper', 'ungrateful', 'unmixed', 'upstart', 'unexperienced', and 'uneasy'.

Roman Forms for Group Names Displace Italic Equivalents. (1) Academic(al)(s) *displ. Academic*(*al*)(*s*): 35.18, 120.3. (2) Christian *displ. Christian*: 83.8, 98.32, 99.23. (3) Jesuits *displ. Jesuits*: 93.38. (4) Pyrrhonism *displ. Pyrrhonism*: 118.18. (5) Stoics *displ. Stoics*: 35.9, 76.24.

Quotation Marks Displace Italics for Quotation. "Utrumque, qui interfuere, nunc quoque memorant, postquam nullum mendacio pretium.": 92.33.

Italic Ordinal Term Displaces Roman Equivalent. (1) *First*: 14.28, 20.14. (2) *Secondly*: 15.3, 20.31.

Italics Added to Displace Small Capitals. (1) *Henriade displ.* Henriade: 20.20. (2) *Belief displ.* Belief: 40.35.

Italics Added to Definitions. (1) *an infinitely intelligent, wise, and good Being*: 14.33. (2) *cotemporary to our birth*: n. 1.6. (3) *such arguments from experience as leave no room for doubt or opposition*: n. 10.4. (4) *the constant conjunction of like objects*: 73.18. (5) *the inference of the understanding from one object to another*: 73.19.

Italics Added to Mentioned Words and the Abbreviation for 'et cetera'. (1) *chance*: 72.22. (2) *cause*: 60.13, 60.21, 72.34. (3) *energy*: n. 17.9. (4) *&c.*: n. 5.3. (5) *force*: n. 17.9. (6) *horse*: n. 34.5. (7) *innate*: n. 1.6. (8) *instincts*: 81.7. (9) *liberty*: 72.6, 72.11, 72.16. (10) *necessity*: 73.17, 73.27. (11) *power*: n. 7, n. 17.9. (12) *proofs*: n. 10.4.

4. Upper Case and Lower Case

Inconsistent upper and lower case has been eliminated by adopting the principal usage in the copytext, the other *ETSS* editions, and other publications and manuscripts, as explained in Part 1 of this Appendix. The conventions of the copytext for lower case and upper case (both large and small capitals) were often violated in the notes, but rarely in the text.

Initial Lower Case Letter Displaces Upper Case. (1) billiard-ball *displ.* Billiard-ball: 26.24, 26.40, 27.11. (2) emperor *displ.* Emperor: 92.18. (3) *energy displ. Energy*: n. 17.9. (4) finibus *displ.* Finibus: n. 9.10. (5) *first displ. First*: 76.8. (6) *force displ. Force*, n. 17.9. (7) *horse displ. Horse*: n. 34.5. (8) *instincts displ. Instincts*: 81.7. (9) lib. *displ.* Lib.: n. 9.10. (10) *power displ. Power*: n. 7, n. 17.9. (11) religion *displ. Religion*: 98.32, 99.23. (12) *secondly displ. Secondly*: 76.11.

Initial Upper Case Letter Displaces Lower Case. (1) Because *displ.* because: 25.18. (2) *Lieutenant displ. lieutenant*: n. 25.33. (3) Supreme *displ.* supreme: 115.5, n. 35.3. (4) When *displ.* when: 14.29. (5) The Contents page was modified to render titles consistent in capitalization.

Small Capitals Displace Lower Case. (1) Academic(al)(s) *displ. Academic*(*al*)(*s*): 35.18, 120.3. (2) Catonis *displ.* Catonis: n. 21. (3) Christian(s) *displ. Christian* or Christian(s): 83.8, 98.32, 98.38, 99.23. (4) Dio. *displ.* Dio.: n. 30. (5) Jesuits *displ.*

Jesuits: 93.38. (6) Le Franc *displ.* le Franc: n. 25.22. (7) Pyrrhonism *displ. Pyrrhonism*: 118.18. (8) St. *displ.* St.: n. 25.52. (9) Stoics *displ. Stoics*: 35.9, 76.24.

5. Typographical Errors (Misprints)

(1) reforms *mispr.* reform: 6.9. (2) annexed *mispr.* annnexed: 16.14. (3) to *mispr.* to to: 34.5. (4) the *mispr.* the the: 56.11. (5) of their *mispr.* oft heir: 66.13. (6) belief *mispr.* believe: 88.32. (7) good *mispr.* good good: 91.22. (8) interests *mispr.* interest: 110.4. (Note: Changes mentioned elsewhere in this Editorial Appendix may be typographical errors. See, for example, the section on 'Hyphenated Word Displaces Unhyphenated Form'.)

6. Errors in Greek

The use of accents and breathings in Greek type has been normalized, but wording and spelling judged acceptable in the printed editions of Hume's day has been retained. Errors in foreign languages other than Greek are reported in the register, but it is more informative to report corrections in Greek in a single location. It is difficult to determine whether these errors are typographical or derive from failures to consult the texts from which they were drawn. The errors should make no substantive difference to the reading of Hume's text or the authors he is quoting.

(1) n. 5.1: *θ' deleted after* περὶ. (2) n. 5.3: *εἰσιν displ. ἐστιν*.

PART 3

NON-SYSTEMATIC CHANGES: A REGISTER OF NON-SYSTEMATIC EMENDATIONS AND SUBSTANTIVE VARIANTS

The third part of this Appendix is the register of non-systematic editorial changes in the text reported individually, together with a list of all substantive variants. Being distinctive, emendations are not candidates for systematic reports, and no overlap or redundancy between the two lists has been permitted (unless a report in Part 3 incorporates a change mentioned in Parts 1 or 2). Emendation is infrequent, but often substantive. The changes, with few exceptions, derive from the authority of some edition of *EHU*, principally the 1777 edition.

Terms, Symbols, and Practices in the Register

Each entry in this register begins with a page and line reference to the critical text. These numbers are followed by the relevant portion of the critical text, hereafter referred to as the *lemma*. The lemma is followed by a bracket ( ]), which is followed by one or more additional portions of text, each portion separated by a vertical line (|). The abbreviations and symbols used in this string are as follows:

] separates the critical text (printed to the left of the ']') from variants in the collated editions (printed to the right of the ']'). The first entry (in order of years) that shows a difference from the lemma entry is always reported in full.

| separates a variant (or other unit) from other variants (or units) of the same entry.

Abbreviated dates. The editions authorized by Hume of *EHU* were published between 1748 and 1777. (See the Introduction to this volume for a history of the editions.) The relevant dates are abbreviated to 48, 50, 56, 58, 60, 64, 67, 68, 70, 72, 77. Items of the form '67' indicate that a variant reading is found in the 1767 edition. Items of the form '48–60' indicate that a particular variant reading is found in all editions published from 1748 to 1760.

~ means identical in all respects, accidental and substantive. These swung dashes are always followed by an abbreviated date. For example, '~ 64–77' indicates that the texts of all editions appearing from 1764 to 1777 are in every respect exactly like the lemma.

In accordance with the above, an entry of the form

5.6 and according] ~ 48–60 | according 64 | ~ 67–77

indicates that at page 5, line 6, the critical text reads 'and according' and that from 1748 to 1760 the text found at line 6 of p. 5 of the critical text also reads 'and according', as it did in every year except 1764, when it read 'according'.

* denotes an otherwise unregistered difference *in accidentals* in the listed editions. Thus, items of the form 48*60 indicate that a variant substantive reading from 48 to 60 is accompanied by a variant accidental not revealed in the record shown here. 'Belief 48*60' indicates that whereas the 48 edition includes the word 'Belief' in precisely that form, at least one later edition appearing by 1760 includes in the same location this same substantive, but in a different accidental form. (In any entry following the ']' or '|' symbols, the accidentals printed at that point in the register are those found in the first year in the string of dates.) Although accidentals are not directly reported in the register, accidental differences in otherwise identical substantives are *always* noted by the marker '*'. The bulk of these variant accidentals involve differences in capitalization, but also include many differences in punctuation. The asterisk is never used in a manner that masks either a substantive or an accidental in the copytext; the reason why such obscuring is impossible is explained under the next entry on shading or redlining.

Shading (or redlining). Entries are shaded whenever they contain *emendations* of the copytext that have not already been reported in block above. The lemma (the critical text) in a shaded entry displays the corrections made to the 1772 copytext. Unshaded entries record variations between editions and contain no emendation (other than those already reported in block). In shaded entries changes in accidentals are often relevant to understanding and evaluating an emendation. Accordingly, in shaded entries only, asterisks (*) are not permitted. The copytext therefore can never be obscured as to differences in accidental forms. The form '~' is

preserved for pure identity, accidental and substantive, so that the reader can easily see which editions have served as models for the emendation.

Er refers to an entry made by Hume in the errata of an edition. Items of the form '58*Er*' indicate that the erratum of an edition (58 in this example) is the source generating a particular variant. The year of a single edition is always specified next to the *Er* form. Thus, 'weakness 58*Er*' means that the erratum in 58 instructs the reader that the correct reading is 'weakness' (and not that 'weakness' is the incorrect reading). A report of the form 'and] or 48–50| ~ 50*Er*-72' means that the printed text in 50 reads 'or' and that the erratum in 50 instructs the reader that the correct reading is 'and'.

. . . Ellipses indicate that material has been omitted from the span of text presented as the lemma. Ellipses are used exclusively in lemmas.

¶ designates the beginning of a paragraph. Though changes of paragraph are accidental variants, they are reported with this symbol.

{ } Material inside these braces indicates a relevant authority (other than routine judgements made by the present editor) for an emendation of the copytext. The following are types of relevant authority: (1) the *person* responsible for suggesting the need for a change, (2) the *publication* in which the change was first made, (3) an *authoritative published text* of an author quoted by Hume. Thus, items of the form {SBN} or {GG} indicate that in emending the text the present editor has concurred with a particular previous editor known to have made the same emendation; {TXT} indicates that a check of an authoritative publication quoted by Hume shows that the source has been misquoted and that the editor has changed Hume's text. Such emendation is rare. Normally these emendations are supported by the printed quotation found in one or more of Hume's early editions, or in *A Treatise of Human Nature*, from which Hume extracted some quotations in his later work. In using 'TXT', an external source may not play any role in the change made to Hume's text. However, if the wording in Hume's version is unintelligible or grammatically incorrect, then a carefully selected external source may suffice to support an emendation. (Usually several such sources have been consulted.) The following abbreviations have been used:

{GG} signifies the edition of Hume's *Philosophical Works* prepared by T. H. Green and T. H. Grose. Details regarding recent facsimile editions are found in the Reference List.

{SBN} signifies the edition of the two *Enquiries* prepared by L. A. Selby-Bigge and revised by P. H. Nidditch. References are to the edition listed in the Reference List.

{MAS} signifies M. A. Stewart.

Few shaded (redlined) entries in the register cite such an authority when there has been an emendation of the copytext. The reason is that the bulk of the substantive changes derive from the authority of the 77 edition or some edition prior to 72. Whenever a redlined string contains a form such as '~ 77' or '~ 58–68', the reader can assume that the editions listed are at least part of the authority for the change.

Usually these authorities are supported by other evidence. Often other editions contain the same form, and commonly there is evidence internal to the copytext that the change reflects a standard internal form.

Authorities are also listed for emendations involving punctuation changes, but authorities are not listed for the following types of change:

1. Spelling and abbreviation
2. Italic and roman
3. Upper and lower case
4. Arabic and roman numerals.

These changes derive largely from inconsistencies in the texts. With the exception of arabic and roman numerals, these changes are reported in the block reports above. They are, in a few cases, repeated more than once, because they are intrinsic to other variants that are reported in the register. These changes have rarely been introduced by previous editors (all of whom used a different copytext from the one in this edition). In cases involving a second listing in the register, redlining is not used, because the primary presentation has already been furnished in the block reports.

An exhaustive search of all posthumous editions of the works of Hume by his various editors has not been undertaken in order to locate possible authorities for these changes. However, it has been established that all previous editions of these works are inconsequential for purposes of systematic emendation of types 1–4.

If material is not in the copytext, but is in one or more of the other editions, the *earliest* text is used as the basis of the first presentation in a string of years in the register. For example, if the material appears in 48*60, the 48 edition and no other is the text displayed. The reason the earliest form is always shown first is to show the original form of publication. Entries of text in the register do not include an item of punctuation unless the punctuation itself is a variant or is needed to locate or make sense of the variant. If there is no contrasting punctuation in another edition, the punctuation is irrelevant to a display of variation. Misprints in editions of *EHU* other than the copytext (of which there are many clear cases) are also excluded from the list of variants.

Some portions of Hume's writings appeared first as main text and in later editions as notes or appendices, or vice versa. This material is here printed and collated as text material if it is text in the 72 edition and as notes if it appears in the 72 notes. The general rule on note material is that the location in the register is determined by the location in the 72 edition.

The editor has attempted to simplify the forms used in the list below to make it as readable as possible. Preference has also been given to short, simple entries, avoiding longer strings of text with more content. This general rule favouring simplicity and atomic units is occasionally overridden, usually by placing two short variants together as a larger and more meaningful unit. A few entries are explained in prose, without employing the above abbreviations.

Front Matter and the Advertisement
(Editions: 48, 50, 56, 58, 60, 64, 67, 68, 70, 72, 77)

(The first edition of *EPM*, the 1757 edition of *Four Dissertations*, and all editions of the *Essays* are not included in this collation of the front matter. See the relevant editions of the Clarendon Hume.)

i.H-t **Half-titles of a work or a collection of works appear in the front matter of *ETSS* in 64, 67, and 72 only. There are no substantive variants in an *identical* title; but there are title replacements, as shown below.**

iii.*Ttl* **Every volume contains a title-page, placed either as p. *i* or p. *iii*. The title for the collection, *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects*, was first adopted in 53–56. The following Advertisement appears in 58 only:**

> ADVERTISEMENT. SOME Alterations are made on the Titles of the Treatises, contained in the following Volume. What in former Editions was called *Essays moral and political*, is here entitled *Essays, moral, political, and literary*, *Part* 1. *The political Discourses* form the *second Part*. What in former Editions was called, *Philosophical Essays concerning human Understanding*, is here entitled *An Enquiry concerning human Understanding*. The *four Dissertations* lately published are dispersed thro' different Parts of this Volume.

vii **Every volume contains a full table of contents. These pages are introduced by headings that are worded to correspond to the particular edition and volume. Variants in these headings are not collated below. However, variants in major titles and section headings reported in the Contents are collated below. Title and section variants in the text (as distinguished from the Contents) are located under the collation of the sections in the text.**

vii AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING] PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS CONCERNING Human Understanding. 48*56| An ENQUIRY concerning HUMAN UNDERSTANDING. 58–77

vii Association] CONNEXIONS 48| CONNEXION 50| ASSOCIATION 56*77 [This title appears to be mistakenly printed in the Contents of the 1748 edition; 'CONNEXION' appears in the chapter title in the text.]

vii Necessary Connexion] POWER *or* NECESSARY CONNEXION. 48–50 |NECESSARY CONNEXION 56*77

vii Of a Particular Providence and of a Future State] *Of the* PRACTICAL

CONSEQUENCES *of* NATURAL RELIGION. 48| *Of a* PARTICULAR PROVIDENCE *and of a* FUTURE STATE. 50*77

vii Academical or Sceptical] SCEPTICAL *or* ACADEMICAL 48–56| academical or sceptical ~ 58–77

[Err.] **Erratum are located in the front matter in 50, and in the endmatter in 53, 56, and 58.**

1. Adv. **Hume's Advertisement was printed in January 1776 in three different formats, to be placed in the unsold copies of the 68, 70, and 72 editions. No copies of the versions printed for insertion in the editions of 68 and 72 have been discovered. (See the annotation, at 125.) The 77 edition is the base text for the Advertisement in the critical edition. This version is distinguished from the 70 edition by several formal variants and the lone substantive variant shown immediately below.**

1. Adv. called] intitled, 70| ~ 77

An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding (Editions:[9] 48, 50, 56, 58, 60, 64, 67, 68, 70, 72, 77)

A half-title occurs from 58 to 77.

Section 1

5.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56| ~ 58–77

5.4 measures] Actions 48–50| actions 56–72| ~ 77

5.6 and according] ~ 48–60| according 64| ~ 67–77

5.7 As virtue, of all objects, is allowed to be the most valuable,] Virtue, of all Objects, is the most valuable and lovely; and accordingly 48*70| ~ 72–77

5.10 and such] such 48–60| ~ 64–77

5.14 and] and of 48| ~ 50–77

5.14 in] into 48| ~ 50–77

5.15 between] betwixt 48–60| ~ 64–77

5.19 consider man in the light of a reasonable rather] treat Man rather as a reasonable 48*68| ~ 70–77

5.21 human nature] Mankind 48*68| ~ 70–77

5.22 it] human Nature 48*68| ~ 70–77

5.23 understanding] Understandings 48*56| ~ 58–77

[9] The Introduction to this volume contains a comparison of some passages in *EHU* 1748 with corresponding passages in *A Treatise of Human Nature*, the *Abstract* of the *Treatise*, and *A Letter from a Gentleman* (using a different method of presentation).

6.1 aim at] please themselves with 48–68 | ~ 70–77
6.2 themselves] they are 48–50 | ~ 56–77
6.3 labour] Labours 48*70 | ~ 72–77
6.6 above] to 48–68 | ~ 70–77
6.10 nearer to that] nearer that 48–72 | ~ 77
6.12 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
6.13 its] its Precepts and 48*56 | ~ 58–77
6.15 heart] Sentiments 48*70 | ~ 72–77
6.15 agitation] Agitation 48–50 | agitations 56–70 | ~ 72–77
6.26 purposes] proposes 48–72 | ~ 77
6.28 falls into error] commits a Mistake 48–50 | commits a mistake 56–70 | commit a mistake 72 | ~ 77
6.30 illusions] Illusions 48*64 | illusion 67–68 | ~ 70–77
6.31 utterly] ~ 48–64 | much 67–68 | ~ 70–77
6.32 maintains his reputation] encreases in Renown 48–50 | ~ 56–77
6.34 be entirely forgotten.] **The following note occurs at this point in 48–50:**

> This is not intended any way to detract from the Merit of Mr. *Locke*, who was really a great Philosopher, and a just and modest Reasoner. 'Tis only meant to shew the common Fate of such abstract Philosophy.

7.1 deemed] esteem'd 48–56 | ~ 58–77
7.2 destitute] void 48–70 | ~ 72–77
7.3 relish] Taste and Relish 48*56 | ~ 58–77
7.4 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
7.10 retreat] Recess 48–50 | ~ 56–77
7.12 exigence] Emergence 48*56 | ~ 58–77
7.20 for] of 48–68 | ~ 70–77
7.26 other] ~ 48–67 | their 68 | ~ 70–77
7.32 will] ~ 48–70 | shall 72–77
7.39 of all] all 48–70 | ~ 72–77
8.11 sentiment] Sentiments, 48 | Sentiment, 50*77
8.12 How painful soever] However painful 48–68 | How painful so ever 70–72 | ~ 77
8.16 useful] highly useful 48–72 | ~ 77
8.22 sentiment] Sentiments 48*70 | ~ 72–77
8.28 business] Business and Employment 48*56 | ~ 58–77
8.29 throughout] thro' 48*68 | ~ 70–77
8.30 correctness] Accuracy 48–50 | ~ 56–77
8.33 operations] Operations 48–50 | operation 56–64 | ~ 67–68 | operation 70 | ~ 72–77

9.2 open up] ~ 48–64 | open 67–68 | ~ 70–77
9.11 fatiguing] disagreeable 48–56 | ~ 58–77
9.12 lies] lie 48 | ~ 50–77
9.16 superstitions] Superstitions 48*56 | superstition 58–60 | ~ 64–77
9.20 remit] remits 48–70 | ~ 72–77
9.22 enemies] Enemies 48*64 | enemy 67–68 | ~ 70–77
9.22 them] ~ 48–64 | him 67–68 | ~ 70–77
9.23 sovereigns] Sovereigns 48*64 | sovereign 67–68 | ~ 70–77
9.24 sufficient reason,] just Cause 48*68 | ~ 70–77
9.26 proper] reasonable 48–68 | ~ 70–77
9.26 an opposite] a direct contrary 48–72 | ~ 77
9.28 disappointment] Disappointments 48*70 | ~ 72–77
9.35 adventurous] ~ 48–64 | enterprizing 67–68 | ~ 70–77
10.2 ever] ~ 48–56 | for ever 58–64 | ~ 67–68 | for ever 70–72 | ~ 77
10.12 Besides] Beside 48–50 | Besides 56*77
10.20 penetration] Subtilty and Penetration 48*56 | ~ 58–77
10.23 heads] Divisions 48*68 | ~ 70–77
10.31 obvious] contemptible 48–56 | ~ 58–77
10.32 obvious] contemptible 48–56 | ~ 58–77
10.32 be esteemed,] appear, 48–56 | ~ 58 | be esteemed 60*77
10.37 several] ~ 48–64 | various 67–68 | ~ 70–77
10.38 distinct] totally distinct 48–68 | ~ 70–77
11.1 lie] lies 48–56 | ~ 58–77
11.2 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
11.10 delineate] delineate and describe 48–56 | ~ 58–77
11.11 intimately concerned?] **The following note occurs at this point in 48–50:**

> That Faculty, by which we discern Truth and Falshood, and that by which we perceive Vice and Virtue had long been confounded with each other, and all Morality was suppos'd to be built on eternal and immutable Relations, which to every intelligent Mind were equally invariable as any Proposition concerning Quantity or Number. But a {[*fn:*] Mr. *Hutcheson.*} late Philosopher has taught us, by the most convincing Arguments, that Morality is nothing in the abstract Nature of Things, but is entirely relative to the Sentiment or mental Taste of each particular Being; in the same Manner as the Distinctions of sweet and bitter, hot and cold, arise from the particular Feeling of each Sense or Organ. Moral Perceptions therefore, ought not to be clas'd with the Operations of the Understanding, but with the Tastes or Sentiments.
>
> It had been usual with Philosophers to divide all the Passions of the Mind into two Classes, the selfish and benevolent, which were suppos'd to stand in constant Opposition and Contrariety; nor was it

thought that the latter could ever attain their proper Object but at the Expence of the former. Among the selfish Passions were rank'd Avarice, Ambition, Revenge: Among the benevolent, natural Affection, Friendship, public Spirit. Philosophers may now {[***fn:***] See *Butler*'s Sermons.} perceive the Impropriety of this Division. It has been prov'd, beyond all Controversy, that even the Passions, commonly esteem'd selfish, carry the Mind beyond Self, directly to the Object; that tho' the Satisfaction of these Passions gives us Enjoyment, yet the Prospect of this Enjoyment is not the Cause of the Passion, but on the contrary the Passion is antecedent to the Enjoyment, and without the former, the latter could never possibly exist; that the Case is precisely the same with the Passions, denominated benevolent, and consequently that a Man is no more interested when he seeks his own Glory than when the Happiness of his Friend is the Object of his Wishes; nor is he any more disinterested when he sacrifices his Ease and Quiet to public Good than when he labours for the Gratification of Avarice and Ambition. Here therefore is a considerable Adjustment in the Boundaries of the Passions, which had been confounded by the Negligence or Inaccuracy of former Philosophers. These two Instances may suffice to show us the Nature and Importance of this Species of Philosophy.

11.19 the revolutions of the planets] their Revolutions 48–50 | ~ 56–77
11.35 those actions] Actions, 48*70 | ~ 72–77
12.1 The like] ~ 48–64 | Such also 67–68 | ~ 70–77
12.2 wholly] altogether 48–56 | ~ 58–77
12.5 justly be deemed] be justly esteem'd 48 | justly be esteem'd 50–56 | ~ 58–77
12.6 that] which 48–70 | ~ 72–77
12.7 on] ~ 48–64 | upon 67–68 | ~ 70–77
12.8 these] those 48 | ~ 50–77
12.16 abstractedness] Abstractedness 48–50 | abstractness 56 | ~ 58–77
12.18 of all] all 48–70 | ~ 72–77
12.19 enquiry] Essays 48*56 | ~ 58 | inquiry 60*77
12.25 hitherto served | serv'd hitherto 48*70 | ~ 72–77

Section 2

13.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
13.1 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
13.5 entirely reach] reach entirely 48–70 | ~ 72–77
13.12 be] ~ 48–50 | to be 56 | ~ 58–64 | to be 67–68 | ~ 70–77
13.20 our] all our 48–50 | ~ 56–77
13.22 colours which] Colours 48*56 | colors which 58*77

13.22 faint and dull] faded and dead 48–50 | ~ 56–77
13.23 or] nor 48–70 | ~ 72–77
13.24 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
13.32 *impression*] *Impressions* 48–50 | ~ 56–77
13.32 I] we 48–56 | ~ 58–77
14.1 distinguished] contradistinguish'd 48–50 | distinguish'd 56*77
14.2 of which we are conscious] we are conscious of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
14.3 those] these 48–50 | ~ 50***Er***–67 | those lively 68 | ~ 70–77
14.7 costs the imagination] costs it 48–56 | costs 58–60 | ~ 64–77
14.12 or] nor 48–70 | ~ 72–77
14.15 our thought] Thought 48*70 | ~ 72–77
14.18 the faculty of] the 48–70 | ~ 72–77
14.26 in] in more 48 | ~ 50–77
14.32 nearer] narrower 48–68 | ~ 70–77
14.35 without limit, those qualities of goodness and wisdom] those Qualities of Goodness and Wisdom, without Bound or Limit 48–50 | ~ 56–77
14.37 which we] we 48–70 | ~ 72–77
14.38 universally true nor] absolutely universal and 48–60 | ~ 64–77
15.2 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
15.4 sensation] Sensations 48 | Sensation 50*77
15.8 in] of 48–68 | ~ 70–77
15.12 wholly] altogether 48–56 | ~ 58–77
15.14 less] lesser 48–56 | ~ 58–77
15.14 idea] Notion 48*68 | ~ 70–77
15.19 to wit,] *viz.* 48–68 | ~ 70–77
15.21 arise, independent of] go before 48–68 | ~ 70–77
15.23 colour] Colours 48*64 | ~ 67–68 | colours 70 | ~ 72–77
15.23 eye] Eyes 48*68 | ~ 70–77
15.23 sound] Sounds 48*64 | ~ 67–68 | sounds 70 | ~ 72–77
15.24 ear] Hearing 48*68 | ~ 70–77
15.32 perfectly] perfectly well 48–64 | ~ 67–68 | perfectly well 70–72 | ~ 77
15.32 except] excepting 48–56 | ~ 58–77
15.37 between] betwixt 48–60 | ~ 64–77
15.38 it be] 'tis 48–68 | it is 70 | ~ 72–77
16.3 so] so particular and 48–50 | ~ 56–77
16.4 scarcely] scarce 48–68 | ~ 70–77
16.7 a proper use were made of it] properly employ'd 48–50 | ~ 56–77
16.9 drawn] drawn such 48–72 | ~ 77
16.13 it] ~ 48–50 | that it 56–70 | ~ 72–77
16.15 vivid] sensible 48–68 | ~ 70–77
16.15 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
16.17 we entertain, therefore,] therefore we entertain 48–50 | we entertain therefore 56*77

16.18 frequent),] frequent) 48–72 | ~ 77
16.22 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 1.1 ideas] our Ideas 48 | Ideas 50*77
n. 1.2 which they] they 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 1.9 by Locke and others;] even by Mr. *Locke* himself, 48*68 | ~ 70–77
n. 1.10 should] would 48 | ~ 50–77
n. 1.11 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
n. 1.15 Locke] Mr. *Locke* 48*68 | ~ 70–77
n. 1.16 undefined] undefin'd 48 | the undefin'd 50 | undefin'd 56*77
n. 1.17 seem] seems 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 1.18 that philosopher's] all that great Man's 48–50 | all that great philosopher's 56–64 | all that philosopher's 67–68 | ~ 70–77
n. 1.18 as well as most other subjects] Subject 48*68 | ~ 70–77

Section 3

17.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
17.*Ttl* ASSOCIATION] CONNEXION 48–50 | ~ 56–77 **This title is printed as** *CONNEXIONS* **in the Contents of the 1748 edition.**
17.1 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
17.5 the] this 48–72 | ~ 77
17.8 ran] run 48–50 | ~ 56–77
17.14 from] away from 48–64 | ~ 67–68 | away from 70–72 | ~ 77
17.15 Among different languages] Amongst the Languages of different Nations 48*56 | Among the languages of different nations 58–70 | ~ 72–77
17.16 ideas, the most compounded] the most compound Ideas 48–50 | ~ 56–77
17.18 ideas] Ideas 48*67 | idea 68 | ~ 70–77
17.18 comprehended in the compound ones] which they express 48–50 | ~ 56–77
17.21 observation] our Observation 48 | Observation 50*77
17.23 association] Connexion 48–50 | ~ 56–77
17.24 worthy] very worthy 48–68 | ~ 70–77
17.24 curiosity] our Curiosity 48 | Curiosity 50*77
17.24 appear] appears 48–50 | ~ 56–77
17.25 namely,] *viz*. 48–70 | ~ 72–77
17.30 a] an 48–50 | ~ 56–77
17.31 scarcely] scarce 48–68 | ~ 70–77
18.1 association] Connexion 48–50 | ~ 56–77
18.4 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
18.8 compleat and entire.] **Section 3 ends and note 6 is repositioned at**

this point in 77 only. All material is deleted in 77 that appeared after this point in Section 3 in pre-1777 editions.

18.9 lead] lead us 48–56 | ~ 58–72
18.11 open] open up 48–50 | ~ 56–72
18.13 man] Man 48–50 | ~ 56–70 | a man 72
18.14 attain by] find in 48–50 | ~ 56–72
18.19 some] any 48–70 | ~ 72
18.25 ravings] Ravings 48*58 | raving 60–64 | ~ 67–72
19.5 and] or 48–50 | ~ 50***Er***–72
19.18 reader] Readers 48*68 | ~ 70–72
19.27 can our thoughts] our Thoughts can 48–50 | ~ 56–72
19.28 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–72
n. 5 **Note 5 occurs only from 48 to 72.**
n. 5.2 *οὐδέν ἐστιν*] {MAS, TXT} | ~ 48–56 | *ἐστιν* 58 | *οὐκ ἐστιν* 60–68 | *ἐστιν* 70 | *ουκ ἐστιν* 72
19.32 Not] Nor 48–56 | ~ 58–72
20.8 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–72
20.10 an] of an 48–50 | ~ 56–72
20.10 passion; circumstances, which] Passions, which 48–50 | passions, circumstances, which 56*70 | ~ 72
20.12 examine the reason, why] see for what Reason 48–50 | examine the reason why 56*72
20.14 brings] approaches 48–68 | ~ 70–72
20.21 scarcely] scarce 48–68 | ~ 70–72
21.1 affections] Affection 48 | Affections 50*72
21.2 Eve] *Eve* 48–56 | ~ 58–70 | Eve, 72
21.6 nowise] no way 48–60 | ~ 64–72
21.10 part] Party 48*70 | ~ 72
21.11 less] lesser 48–50 | ~ 56–72
21.12 entirely] altogether 48–56 | ~ 58–72
21.14 of the] of 48–50 | ~ 56–72
21.15 near] ~ 48 | nearer 50 | ~ 50***Er***–72
21.19 and, by means of the near relation of the objects, continually encreases] and continually encreases, by means of the near Relation of the Objects 48–50 | ~ 56 | and, by means of the near relation of the objects, continually increases 58–72
21.25 separated] separate 48–56 | ~ 58–72
21.28 terror, which] Terror 48–50 | ~ 56–72
21.31 nowise] no way 48–60 | no wise 64–67 | ~ 68 | no wise 70–72
21.35 part] party 48*70 | ~ 72
21.35 scene of action?] **The following paragraph occurs at this point from 48 to 60:**

BUT tho' this Rule of Unity of Action be common to dramatic and epic Poetry; we may still observe a Difference betwixt {betwixt 48–58 | between 60} them, which may, perhaps, deserve our Attention. In both these Species of Composition, 'tis requisite {requisite 48–50 | requisite that 56–60} the Action be one and simple, in order to preserve the Concern or Sympathy entire and undiverted: But in epic or narrative Poetry, this Rule is also establish'd upon another Foundation, *viz.* the Necessity, that is incumbent on every Writer, to form some Plan or Design, before he enter on any Discourse or Narration, and to comprehend his Subject in some general Aspect or united View, which may be the constant Object of his Attention. As the Author is entirely lost in dramatic Compositions, and the Spectator supposes himself to be really present at the Actions represented; this Reason has no Place with regard to the Stage; but any Dialogue or Conversation may be introduc'd, which, without Improbability, might have pass'd in that determinate Portion of Space, represented by the Theatre. Hence in all our *English* Comedies, even those of *Congreve*, the Unity of Action is never strictly observ'd; but the Poet thinks it sufficient, if his Personages be any way related to each other, by Blood, or by living in the same Family; and he afterwards introduces them in particular Scenes, where they display their Humours and Characters, without much forwarding the main Action. The double Plots of *Terence* are Licences of the same Kind; but in a lesser {lesser 48–50 | less 56–60} Degree. And tho' this Conduct be not perfectly regular, it is not wholly unsuitable to the Nature of Comedy, where the Movements and Passions are not rais'd to such a height as in Tragedy; at the same time, that the Fiction or Representation palliates, in some Degree {Degree 48–50 | measure 56–60}, such Licences. In a narrative Poem, the first Proposition or Design confines the Author to one Subject; and any Digressions of this Nature would, at first View, be rejected, as absurd and monstrous. Neither *Boccace*, la Fontaine, nor any Author of that Kind, tho' Pleasantry be their chief Object, have ever indulg'd them.

21.38 in] to 48–70 | ~ 72
21.38 in] to 48–70 | ~ 72
22.6 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–72
22.16 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–72
22.16 these] ~ 48–56 | those 58–60 | ~ 64–72
22.17 another] the other 48–50 | ~ 56–72
n. 6 **Note 6 occurs at the same point in the text in 48–72; it was**

relocated to a different point in 77 as the result of the deletion of a large segment of text in 77.

n. 6.1 Contrast] Contraste 48–58 | ~ 60–72 | For instance, Contrast 77
n. 6.1 is] ~ 48–72 | is also 77
n. 6.1 connexion] Species of Connexion 48*58 | ~ 58***Er***–77
n. 6.1 ideas, which] ~ 48–72 | ideas: But it 77
n. 6.2 mixture of causation and resemblance] Species of Resemblance 48*58 | ~ 60–72 | mixture of *Causation* and *Resemblance* 77
n. 6.3 i.e. is] *i.e.* is 48*72 | that is, 77
n. 6.3 its] ~ 48–50 | his 56–58 | ~ 58***Er***–77
22.17 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–72
22.18 among] amongst 48–56 | ~ 58–72
22.18 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–72
22.19 so long a] so long 48–50 | such long 56–70 | ~ 72
22.25 of the] ~ 48–64 | the 67–68 | ~ 70–72
22.32 imagination] Imagination 48–50 | imaginations 56 | ~ 60–72
23.7 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–72
23.9 another object] another 48–70 | ~ 72
23.15 reasonings] Reasonings 48*64 | reasoning 67–68 | ~ 70–72
23.16 this enquiry] these Essays 48*56 | ~ 58–72
23.16 It is sufficient] 'Tis sufficient for us 48 | 'Tis sufficient 50–68 | ~ 70–72

Section 4

24.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
24.2 to wit,] *viz.* 48–72 | ~ 77
24.3 sciences of] Propositions in 48*56 | ~ 58–77
24.3 affirmation, which] Proposition, that 48–50 | proposition, which 56 | ~ 58–77
24.4 *square*] *Squares* 48*58 | ~ 60–77
24.5 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
24.6 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
24.7 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
24.10 circle] true Circle 48*58 | ~ 60–77
24.10 truths,] Propositions, 48*50 | truths 56*77
24.11 their certainty] all their Truth 48–50 | ~ 56–77
24.13 ascertained] ascertain'd to us 48–50 | ascertain'd 56*77
24.16 the same facility and distinctness] equal Distinctness and Facility 48*56 | equal facility and distinctness 58–70 | ~ 72–77
24.17 reality] Truth and Reality 48*56 | ~ 58–77
24.22 worthy of] worthy 48–68 | ~ 70–77
25.5 on] ~ 48–50 | in 56–70 | ~ 72–77

25.6 we can] can we 48–60 | ~ 64 | can we 67–68 | ~ 70–77
25.14 between] betwixt 48 | ~ 50–77
25.15 which is inferred] infer'd 48*70 | ~ 72–77
25.16 entirely] altogether 48–56 | ~ 58–77
25.18 the effects] the Effects 48*64 | effects 67–68 | ~ 70–77
25.20 on] ~ 48–50 | in 56–68 | ~ 70–77
25.25 matters] all Matters 48*70 | ~ 72–77
25.26 cause and effect] Causes and Effects 48–50 | ~ 56–77
25.28 relation] Relation of Cause and Effect 48–50 | ~ 56–77
25.29 that any] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
25.30 an] any 48–50 | ~ 56–77
25.32 not] never 48–50 | ~ 56–77
25.34 entirely] ever so 48–50 | ~ 56–77
25.39 inference] Inferences 48*70 | ~ 72–77
26.3 once been] been once 48–70 | ~ 72–77
26.4 inability, which] Inability 48–50 | inability which 56*77
26.6 he] and whatever Degree of Sense or Reason he may be endow'd with, he 48–50 | ~ 56–77
26.8 a resistance] Resistance 48 | a Resistance 50 | resistance 56–58 | ~ 60–77
26.10 confessed] acknowledged 48 | confess'd 50*77
26.14 in attributing] to attribute 48–68 | ~ 70–77
26.17 sight] View 48*56 | ~ 58–77
26.22 operation] Operations 48*70 | ~ 72–77
26.23 on] of 48–50 | ~ 50***Er***–77
26.33 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
26.36 that this] this 48–50 | ~ 56–77
26.37 The mind] It 48–50 | ~ 56–77
27.8 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
27.13 may] might 48 | ~ 50–77
27.13 different] other different 48 | ~ 50–77
27.18 or] nor 48–70 | ~ 72–77
27.25 In vain, therefore, should we] 'Twould, therefore, be in vain for us to 48–50 | In vain, therefore, shou'd we 56*77
27.26 or] ~ 48–68 | nor 70 | ~ 72–77
27.28 who is] that has been 48–50 | ~ 56–77
27.29 cause] Causes 48 | Cause 50*77
27.29 natural operation] of the Operations of Nature 48–50 | ~ 56–77
27.30 action] Actions 48 | Action 50*77
27.40 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
28.3 only staves off] does only stave off 48 | ~ 50–64 | only removes 67–68 | ~ 70–77
28.4 longer] ~ 48–64 | further 67–68 | ~ 70–77
28.5 our ignorance] our Ignorance 48*72 | it 77

28.6 blindness] Ignorance 48*56 | ~ 58–77
28.6 all] all our 48 | ~ 50–77
28.7 elude] conquer, 48–56 | elude, 58*77
28.12 proceeds] goes still 48 | goes 50–68 | ~ 70–77
28.16 degree] Degrees 48*70 | ~ 72–77
28.29 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
28.32 operations] Operations 48–50 | ~ 56–70 | operation 72–77
28.33 as yet] ~ 48–72 | yet 77
29.4 sifting] sifting and examining 48–56 | ~ 58–77
29.4 *all*] *all our* 48–60 | ~ 64–77
29.5 implies] produces 48–50 | ~ 56–77
29.14 section] Essay 48*56 | ~ 58–77
29.24 sense] Senses 48*60 | ~ 64–77
29.25 can ever] ever can 48–70 | ~ 72–77
29.26 conveys] convey 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 7 **Note 7 occurs from 50 to 77**.
n. 7.2 Section 7] Essay vii 50–56 | Sect. 7 58–77
29.31 when] where 48–72 | ~ 77
29.32 expect] lay our Account 48*68 | ~ 70–77
29.34 bread] Bread 48–50 | ~ 56–60 | of bread 64–72 | ~ 77
29.35 foresee] expect 48–68 | ~ 70–77
30.1 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
30.4 which it] it 48–50 | ~ 56–77
30.5 of those precise objects only] only of those precise Objects 48*70 | ~ 72–77
30.9 on which I would insist] I would insist on 48–50 | ~ 56–77
30.9 bread, which] Bread 48–50 | ~ 56–77
30.10 endowed] endow'd 48–56 | endued 58–77
30.13 nowise] no way 48–60 | nowise 64–77
30.18 *in*] *to* 48–60 | ~ 64–77
30.22 to] may 48–50 | ~ 56–77
30.22 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
30.33 enquiry] Research and Enquiry 48*68 | ~ 70–77
30.38 namely,] *viz*. 48–72 | namely 77
30.38 reasoning] Reasonings 48*70 | ~ 72–77
30.39 that] those 48–70 | ~ 72–77
30.39 moral reasoning,] moral or probable Reasonings, 48–50 | moral reasonings 56*70 | ~ 72–77
30.39 that] those 48–70 | ~ 72–77
31.2 an object,] Objects 48–50 | an object 56*77
31.3 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
31.7 will flourish] flourish 48–50 | ~ 56 | will florish 58*77
31.10 argument] Arguments 48*64 | ~ 67–68 | arguments 70 | ~ 72–77
31.10 reasoning] Reasonings 48*64 | ~ 67–68 | reasonings 70 | ~ 72–77

31.14 is no argument] are no Arguments 48*64 | ~ 67–68 | are no arguments 70 | ~ 72–77
31.34 that,] that 48–68 | ~ 70 | that 72 | ~ 77
31.36 Nothing] ~ 48–68 | Nothing is 70 | ~ 72–77
31.37 appearing] apparent 48–70 | ~ 72–77
32.2 nowise] no way 48–60 | ~ 64–77
32.2 one] Instance 48*70 | ~ 72–77
32.7 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
32.9 this *inference* is] this *Inference* is 48*64 | is this *inference* 67–68 | ~ 70–77
32.11 consistence,] Consistence, 48–50 | ~ 56–58 | consistence 60–72 | ~ 77
32.20 object, endowed with] Object of 48–50 | object, endow'd with 56*77
32.22 look for] lay our Account with 48*68 | ~ 70–77
32.22 like] a like 48–50 | ~ 56–77
32.23 expect] look for 48–68 | ~ 70–77
32.28 say that] say 48–50 | ~ 56–67 | say, that 68*77
32.29 the other] ~ 48 | another 50–60 | ~ 64–77
32.29 inference] Inferences 48–50 | ~ 56–77
32.36 conclusion] Conclusions 48–50 | ~ 56–77
32.39 ever] never 48–56 | ~ 58–77
33.11 such] such vast 48–68 | ~ 70–77
33.12 small hopes] small Hopes 48 | little Hope 50 | ~ 56–77
33.16 investigation] Investigation and Enquiry 48*56 | ~ 58–77
33.18 themselves] their Time 48*70 | ~ 72–77
33.18 search] Search 48*64 | researches 67–68 | ~ 70–77
33.31 in] to 48 | ~ 50–77
33.34 pretence] Pretext 48*60 | ~ 64–77
33.36 enquiry] Search and Enquiry 48*56 | ~ 58–77
33.37 or] and 48–56 | ~ 58–77
33.38 in] by 48–56 | ~ 58–77
34.2 section] Essay 48*56 | ~ 58–77
34.2 not to have made any] to have made no 48–68 | ~ 70–77

Section 5

35.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
35.10 reason] ~ 48–64 | may reason 67–68 | ~ 70–77
35.12 towards] on 48–60 | ~ 64–77
35.14 pretence] Pretext 48*64 | ~ 67–77
35.19 always talk] talk always 48–72 | ~ 77
35.19 doubt] Doubts 48*70 | ~ 72–77
35.22 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
36.5 doubts] Doubts 48*64 | doubt 67 | ~ 68–77
36.8 section] Essay 48*56 | ~ 58–77

36.10 that] ~ 48–64 | lest 67–68 | ~ 70–77
36.17 on] of 48–50 | ~ 50*Er*–77
36.24 the] and the 48–68 | ~ 70–77
36.25 one] the one 48–72 | ~ 77
36.27 of] ~ 48–56 | or 58–64 | ~ 67–68 | or 70–72 | ~ 77
36.33 one] the one 48–72 | ~ 77
37.16 draw, from a thousand instances, an inference] draw an Inference from a thousand Instances 48–50 | ~ 56–77
37.18 conclusions, which] Conclusions 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 8.2 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
n. 8.13 between] betwixt 48–68 | ~ 70–77
n. 8.20 active and] ~ 48–72 | active 77
n. 8.21 that] that, in my opinion, 48–56 | ~ 58–77
n. 8.21 bottom] the Bottom 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 8.21 or at] ~ 48–72 | at 77
n. 8.24 will] will all 48–60 | ~ 64–77
n. 8.26 between] betwixt 48–68 | ~ 70–77
n. 8.35 danger which] Danger 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 8.35 In both cases, it is experience] 'Tis Experience, in both Cases, 48–50 | In both cases, 'tis experience 56*77
n. 8.39 a man] he 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 8.40 experience] Experience, 48–50 | experience, 56–72 | ~ 77
38.9 that] ~ 48–68 | that, 70–72 | ~ 77
38.11 happened] happen'd 48*67 | happen 68 | ~ 70–77
38.16 form] be able to form 48 | ~ 50–77
38.21 the] our 48–50 | ~ 56–77
39.12 between] betwixt 48–64 | ~ 67–77
39.12 some] any 48–70 | ~ 72–77
39.15 the] our 48–70 | ~ 72–77
39.20 reasoning] Reason 48 | Reasoning 50*77
39.29 meet with] ~ 48–56 | meet 58–60 | ~ 64–77
39.33 section] Essay 48*56 | ~ 58–77
39.34 enquiries] Essays 48*56 | ~ 58–77
39.35 Nothing is] THERE is nothing 48*68 | ~ 70–77
39.36 furnished] which is furnish'd 48*68 | ~ 70–77
39.36 the] our 48–50 | ~ 56–77
40.1 in] to 48–70 | ~ 72–77
40.6 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
40.7 such a] a 48–50 | ~ 56–77
40.7 as] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
40.14 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
40.22 In this] Herein 48–50 | ~ 56–77
40.23 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77

40.25 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
40.26 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
40.32 *definition*] Definition or Description 48–50 | ~ 56–77
40.33 not an] not 48 | ~ 50–77
40.34 a creature who] such as 48–50 | ~ 56–77
40.35 any] an 48–70 | ~ 72–77
40.40 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
41.12 this] that 48–68 | ~ 70–77
41.16 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
41.21 weight] Force 48*68 | ~ 70–77
41.23 of] of all 48–68 | ~ 70–77
41.24 with whom I am acquainted] whom I am acquainted with 48–50 | ~ 56–77
41.24 the] this 48–50 | ~ 56–77
41.25 thought] Thoughts 48 | Thought 50*77
41.26 together] along 48–56 | ~ 58–77
41.27 of which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
41.28 possessed] possest of 48–50 | possest 56–72 | ~ 77
41.33 conception] Conception of an Object 48*68 | ~ 70–77
41.36 that it] it 48–50 | ~ 56–77
41.40 one idea] one 48–50 | ~ 56–77
42.3 namely,] *viz*. 48–68 | ~ 70–77
42.5 less] lesser 48–50 | ~ 56–77
42.6 among] amongst 48–56 | ~ 58–77
42.13 this may be established] we may establish this 48–60 | ~ 64–77
42.13 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
42.20 or at] ~ 48–72 | at 77
42.25 but when] ~ 48–64 | when 67–68 | ~ 70–77
42.29 instances] Experiments 48*68 | ~ 70–77
42.29 superstition] strange Superstition 48–50 | ~ 56–77
42.30 for] of 48–68 | ~ 70–77
42.33 decay] decay away 48–50 | ~ 56–77
42.38 ideas] Idea 48*56 | ~ 58–77
43.8 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
43.8 imitates] ~ 48–67 | intimates 68 | ~ 70–77
43.16 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
n. 9.6 videmus] {MAS, TXT} | videamus 48–77
n. 9.7 nostram,] ~ 48–68 | nostram 70–77
n. 9.9 inest] {MAS, TXT} | est 48–77
n. 9.9 ducta] {MAS, TXT} | deducta 48–77
n. 9.10 finibus. lib.] *Finibus*. *Lib*. 48–50 | *Finibus*. 58–67 | *Finibus*, Lib. 68 | *Finibus*. Lib. 70–77
43.23 evident that] evident 48–50 | evident, that 56*77

43.23 which a] a 48–50 | ~ 56–77
43.30 that the] the 48–50 | ~ 56–77
43.32 all] all our 48–50 | ~ 56–77
44.5 effect] Effect in inlivening the Idea 48*68 | ~ 70–77
44.16 moves] passes 48–50 | ~ 56–77
44.16 towards] to 48–50 | ~ 56–77
44.21 occur] be presented 48 | ~ 50–77
44.22 except] but 48–50 | ~ 56–77
44.22 and a] ~ 48 | and 50–60 | ~ 64–77
44.29 Here, then,] HERE 48–60 | ~ 64–77
44.29 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
44.30 succession] Successions 48 | Succession 50*77
44.32 with the] ~ 48 | with 50 | ~ 50***Er***–77
44.33 principle] admirable Principle 48*68 | ~ 70–77
44.39 or] nor 48–60 | ~ 64–77
45.3 for] as 48 | ~ 50–77
45.3 further] farther 48 | ~ 50–77
45.3 as this] ~ 48–67 | this 68 | ~ 70–77
45.6 that it] it 48–50 | ~ 56–77
45.9 conformable to the ordinary wisdom] like the ordinary Prudence 48–50 | ~ 56–77
45.15 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77

Section 6

46.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
n. 10.3 ought to] should 48–70 | ~ 72–77
46.10 would] should 48–60 | ~ 64–77
46.12 side different] opposite Side 48*56 | ~ 58–77
46.14 those] those, 48–72 | ~ 77
46.15 curious] very curious 48–68 | ~ 70–77
46.15 speculation] Speculation 48*56 | speculations 58–70 | ~ 72–77
46.20 in the] ~ 48–50 | the 56 | ~ 58–77
46.21 mind] View 48–50 | ~ 56–77
46.23 of] of the 48–50 | ~ 56–77
46.26 smaller] lesser 48–50 | ~ 56–77
47.1 the] its 48–68 | ~ 70–77
47.10 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
47.11 which] ~ 48–64 | that 67–68 | ~ 70–77
47.12 always proved] prov'd always 48–56 | proved always 58–72 | ~ 77
47.26 assign to] give 48–70 | ~ 72–77
47.28 almost every] every 48–68 | ~ 70–77
47.28 country] Place 48*68 | ~ 70–77

47.30 open] fresh 48 | ~ 50–77
47.33 effect, which] Effect that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
47.38 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
47.38 its object] it 48–70 | ~ 72–77
47.38 the contrary event] its Antagonist 48*70 | ~ 72–77
47.40 recurs] occurs 48–70 | ~ 72–77
48.4 defective] extremely defective 48–68 | ~ 70–77
48.4 common] receiv'd 48 | ~ 50–77

Section 7

49.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
49.*Ttl* NECESSARY] POWER *or necessary* 48–50 | *necessary* 56*77
49.1 sciences above the moral] ~ 48–64 | above the moral sciences 67–68 | ~ 70–77
49.3 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
49.19 nearly] do very nearly 48–50 | very nearly 56–70 | ~ 72–77
49.26 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
49.28 scarcely] scarce 48–68 | ~ 70–77
49.28 in] of 48–58 | ~ 60–77
49.30 Where we] If we can 48–50 | ~ 56–77
49.30 a] ~ 48–64 | but a 67–68 | ~ 70–77
49.31 considering] ~ 48–50 | if we consider 56 | ~ 58–77
50.6 forming of] forming 48–72 | ~ 77
50.6 And,] And 48–72 | ~ 77
50.7 chiefly] mostly 48–50 | ~ 56–77
50.8 are often] often are 48–70 | ~ 72–77
50.10 improvement] Improvements 48*70 | ~ 72–77
50.12 among] amongst 48 | ~ 50–77
50.13 superior] the greatest 48–50 | ~ 56–77
50.14 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
50.15 of which] which 48–50 | ~ 56–77
50.16 treat] treat of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
50.17 section] Essay 48*56 | ~ 58–77
50.23 endeavoured] endeavour'd in a former Essay 48*56 | endeavored 58*77
n. 11.1 Section 2] Essay II 48–56 | Section II 58–77
50.25 reach] be able to reach 48–50 | ~ 56–77
50.26 been] been ever 48–70 | ~ 72–77
50.28 or] ~ 48–68 | of 70 | ~ 72–77
50.34 ambiguity] Ambiguity and Obscurity 48*56 | ~ 58–77
51.1 ideas, that] Objects, that 48–50 | ideas, which 56–72 | ~ 77
51.2 object] Subjects 48–50 | ~ 56–77
51.2 enquiry] Disquisition and Enquiry 48–50 | ~ 56–58 | inquiry 60*77

51.4 the impression] that 48*50 | ~ 56–77
51.5 for it in] for 48–50 | ~ 50*Er*–77
51.8 a] any 48 | ~ 50–77
51.14 not,] nothing 48–50 | not 56*77
51.15 any thing which] which 48–50 | ~ 56–77
51.32 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
n. 12.4 philosopher himself] Philosopher 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 12.5 origin] Original 48*56 | ~ 58–77
52.2 operation] Operations 48*70 | ~ 72–77
52.3 whether] if 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.5 internal power;] Power in our own Minds, 48*68 | ~ 70–77
52.7 mind] Minds, in their Operation 48*70 | ~ 72–77
52.11 This idea, then, is] The Operations and mutual Influence of Bodies are, perhaps, sufficient to prove, that they also are possess'd of it. However this may be, the Idea of Power must certainly be allow'd to be 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.12 mind] Minds 48*70 | ~ 72–77
52.13 both over] over 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.14 soul] Mind 48*70 | ~ 72–77
52.15 first with regard to the influence of volition over the organs of the body. This influence, we may observe] shall endeavour to avoid, as far as we are able, all Jargon and Confusion, in treating of such subtile and such profound Subjects. {¶} I assert, then, in the *first* Place, that the Influence of Volition over the Organs of the Body 48 | shall endeavour to avoid, as far as we are able, all Jargon and Confusion, in treating of such subtile and such profound Subjects. {¶} I assert, then, that the Influence of Volition over the Organs of the Body 50 | ~ 56–77
52.17 events] Operations 48*70 | ~ 72–77
52.17 can] could 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.18 can] could 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.19 an infallible] a necessary 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.20 motion] Motions 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.20 follows] follow 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.21 Of this] This 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.21 conscious.] conscious of: 48–50 | conscious: 56*77
52.23 of this] this 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.23 conscious] conscious of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.24 enquiry] Search and Enquiry 48*56 | ~ 58 | inquiry 60*77
52.26 soul] the Soul 48 | Soul 50*77
52.26 body] the Body 48 | Body 50*77
52.28 matter] Body 48 | Matter 50*77
52.29 orbit] Orbits 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.29 authority] Authority over Matter 48 | Authority 50*77

52.30 our] the Bounds of our 48 | ~ 50–77
52.36 reason] other Reason, 48*70 | ~ 72–77
52.37 between] betwixt 48–60 | ~ 64–77
52.37 one] the one 48–50 | ~ 56–77
52.38 not] and not 48–72 | ~ 77
53.1 not] and not 48–68 | ~ 70–77
53.6 suddenly struck] struck suddenly 48–72 | ~ 77
53.8 in] to 48–50 | ~ 56–77
53.9 is conscious of power] is 48–50 | ~ 56–77
53.11 in the] the 48 | ~ 50–77
53.12 learn] only learn 48–50 | ~ 56–77
53.13 experience alone] Experience 48–50 | ~ 56–77
53.18 and,] and 48–72 | ~ 77
53.25 the one] that 48–70 | ~ 72–77
53.30 nor] or 48–68 | ~ 70–77
53.33 in such] in 48–50 | ~ 56–77
53.33 manner as] Manner, that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
53.33 wholly] altogether 48–56 | ~ 58–77
n. 13.2 force] Power 48 | Force 50*77
n. 13.6 its] our 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 13.8 of] ~ 48 | to 50 | ~ 56–77
n. 13.10 know it] know 48 | ~ 50–77
n. 13.10 It must, . . . of it. **This sentence occurs only in 56–77.**
n. 13.12 it.] it. See p. 122. 56 | it. See p. 326. 58 | it. See p. 121. 60 | it. See p. 89. 64–67 | it. See p. 92. 68 | ~ 70–77
54.5 the] a 48–70 | ~ 72–77
54.6 think] think, 48–64 | ~ 67–68 | think, 70–72 | ~ 77
54.12 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
54.12 them] the one and the other 48 | ~ 50–77
54.18 namely,] *viz*. 48–68 | ~ 70–77
54.19 in] by 48–56 | ~ 58–77
54.23 limits] Limitations 48–50 | ~ 56–77
54.24 acquaintance with] Contemplation of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
54.24 cause] the Cause 48*60 | ~ 64–77
54.24 effect] the Effect 48–50 | ~ 56–77
54.28 boundaries] Limits 48–50 | bounds 56 | ~ 58–77
54.29 boundaries] Limits 48*56 | ~ 58–77
54.29 and not] ~ 48–72 | not 77
55.3 master] Masters 48 | Master 50*77
55.5 the power] the Power 48*60 | power 64 | ~ 67–77
55.6 here, either in a spiritual or material substance, or both, some secret mechanism or structure of parts,] here some secret Mechanism or Structure of Parts, either in a spiritual or material Substance or both; 48*50 |

here, either in a spiritual, or material substance, or both, some secret mechanism or structure of parts, 56*77

55.8 entirely] altogether 48–56 | ~ 58 | intirely 60*77
55.12 with] by 48–56 | ~ 58–77
55.15 as] ~ 48 | a 50 | ~ 56–77
55.16 of which we are possessed,] which we are possess'd of in the Case, 48*50 | ~ 56–77
55.22 or] and 48–58 | ~ 60–77
55.27 pestilence] Pestilences 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 14.1 **Note 14 occurs as a note from 50 to 77. Note 14 occurs as text in the following form in 48 only:**

(*quasi Deus ex machina*).

The following addition to note 14 occurs in 50 only:

Cic. de Nat. Deorum.

55.35 unusual] extraordinary and unusual 48–56 | ~ 58–77
55.36 objects] one Object with another 48 | Objects 50*77
55.37 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
56.4 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
56.8 should, for ever, be] should be for ever 48–50 | ~ 56–77
56.10 they say] ~ 48–64 | say they 67–68 | ~ 70–77
56.18 one] the one 48–50 | ~ 56–77
56.20 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
56.28 extend] apply 48–50 | ~ 56–77
56.28 inference] Inferences 48–50 | ~ 56–77
56.32 Creator] Creator of all Things 48*68 | ~ 70–77
56.35 content] contented 48–68 | ~ 70–77
56.41 inferior] his inferior 48 | ~ 50–77
56.41 produce] operate 48–70 | ~ 72–77
57.1 his own] his 48–50 | ~ 56–77
57.3 its] its own 48–50 | ~ 56–77
57.9 man,] Man, who is 48*68 | ~ 70–77
57.12 which conduct] that lead 48–50 | ~ 56–77
57.12 logical] conclusive and logical 48–50 | ~ 56–77
57.13 carried] led 48 | carry'd 50*77
57.14 leads to] establishes 48 | ~ 50–77
57.15 fairy land] Fairy-land 48*60 | a fairy land 64 | fairy-land 67*77
57.17 to think] think 48–60 | ~ 64–77
57.18 authority] Weight or Authority 48–50 | ~ 56–77
57.20 step which] Step 48–50 | step, which 56*77
n. 15.1 Section 12] Essay XII 48–56 | Section XII 58–68 | Sect. XII 70 | Section XII 72–77

57.32 rejecting] our rejecting 48 | ~ 50–77
57.33 denying] refusing 48–50 | ~ 56–77
57.33 in] to 48–50 | ~ 56–77
57.33 in] to 48–50 | ~ 56–77
57.34 one] the one 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 16.7 second causes] Matter 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 16.9 fluid] Matter 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 16.15 suppose] ~ 48–50 | supposed 56–68 | ~ 70–77
58.7 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
58.10 or] ~ 48–50 | nor 56–70 | ~ 72–77
58.10 together the motion and volition] them together 48–50 | ~ 56–77
58.12 its] our 48–58 | ~ 60–77
58.13 throughout] thro' 48*70 | ~ 72–77
58.14 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
58.16 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
58.17 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
58.22 there still remains] we have still 48–50 | ~ 56–77
58.26 that object] those Objects 48–50 | ~ 56–77
58.26 is] are 48–50 | ~ 56–77
59.3 temerity] Rashness and Temerity 48–50 | ~ 56–77
59.5 event] Events 48–50 | ~ 56–77
59.6 of foretelling] to foretell 48*68 | ~ 70–77
59.6 one] the one 48–72 | ~ 77
59.7 of employing] to employ 48–68 | ~ 70–77
59.8 the] and the 48–72 | ~ 77
59.9 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
59.12 among events] amongst Objects or Events 48–50 | amongst events 56 | ~ 58 | from events 60 | amongst events 64–68 | ~ 70–77
59.13 instances, which occur,] Instances 48–50 | ~ 56–68 | instances which occur, 70–72 | ~ 77
59.14 nor can that idea ever] and can never 48–50 | ~ 56–77
59.15 there is nothing] what is there 48 | ~ 50–77
59.17 except only] Nothing but this 48 | ~ 50–77
59.20 this] or 48–68 | ~ 70–77
59.21 the] the only 48–50 | ~ 56–77
59.24 that] this 48–68 | ~ 70–77
59.24 This is the sole] There is no other 48 | This is the only 50 | ~ 56–77
59.24 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
59.25 can never] never can 48–70 | ~ 72–77
59.28 event] Effect 48–50 | ~ 56–77
59.28 that] this, that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
59.33 one] the one 48 | ~ 50–77
59.33 we say, therefore,] therefore, we say, 48–50 | ~ 56–77

59.35 thought] Thoughts 48*70 | ~ 72–77
59.39 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
59.40 conclusions] Conclusion 48 | Conclusions 50*77
60.1 limits] Limitations 48–50 | ~ 56–77
60.5 to us] us 48–72 | ~ 77
60.8 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
60.9 sciences,] Science 48 | Sciences 50*77
60.11 about] concerning 48 | ~ 50–77
60.11 Yet] And yet 48–72 | ~ 77
60.12 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
60.15 Suitably] Suitable 48–68 | ~ 70–77
60.17 Or in other words, *where, if the first object had not been, the second never had existed*. The] The 48–50 | ~ 56–77
60.19 always conveys] does always convey 48 | ~ 50–77
60.20 suitably] suitable 48–68 | ~ 70–77
60.26 distinct notion] Notion 48 | distinct Notion 50*77
60.32 *one*] *the one* 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 17 **Note 17 occurs from 50 to 77; it was enlarged in 56, as below.**
n. 17.9 As to the . . . which they occasion.] A *Cause* is different from a *Sign*; as it implies Precedency and Contiguity in Time and Place, as well as constant Conjunction. A Sign is nothing but a correlative Effect from the same Cause. 50 | ~ 56–77
n. 17.11 between] betwixt 56–58 | ~ 60–77
n. 17.21 between] betwixt 56–58 | ~ 60–77
61.1 section] Essay 48*56 | ~ 58–77
61.3 that there] there 48–50 | ~ 56–77
61.9 to wit,] *viz*. 48–68 | ~ 70–77
61.9 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
61.11 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
61.16 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
61.17 illustration] Instance 48*70 | ~ 72–77
61.18 instance] one, 48–50 | ~ 56–77
61.19 one] the one 48–50 | ~ 56–77
61.20 whether] if 48–70 | ~ 72–77
61.25 in] of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
61.26 This point of view] This 48–60 | ~ 64–77
61.26 reach] attain 48–60 | ~ 64–77
61.27 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77

Section 8

62.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
62.1 in] that, in 48–50 | ~ 56–77

62.3 that the] the 48–50 | ~ 56–77
62.10 this] that 48–70 | ~ 72–77
62.10 on foot] afoot 48–50 | ~ 56–77
62.13 mind] Soul 48*68 | ~ 70–77
62.14 every individual] all Men 48–50 | ~ 56–77
62.15 men affix] they affix'd 48 | they affix 50 | ~ 56–77
62.16 that they] they 48–50 | ~ 56–77
62.19 men] they 48–50 | ~ 56–77
62.20 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
62.25 preserve] ~ 48–64 | keep 67–68 | ~ 70–77
62.26 keep] ~ 48–64 | hold 67–68 | ~ 70–77
62.30 find, that] find 48–64 | ~ 67–68 | find 70 | ~ 72–77
62.30 have always been] to have been always 48–64 | have been always 67–68 | to have been always 70 | ~ 72–77
62.31 this] that 48–70 | ~ 72–77
63.4 sensible] sensible and polite 48–60 | ~ 64–77
63.10 make it] make 48–56 | ~ 58–77
63.11 doctrines] Doctrines 48–50 | ~ 56–68 | doctrine 70–77
63.12 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
63.12 terms] Expressions 48*56 | ~ 58–77
63.16 natural effect] Effect 48*56 | ~ 58–77
63.17 energy] Nature and Energy 48*56 | ~ 58–77
63.18 it] the Operation of that Cause 48*70 | ~ 72–77
63.25 continually shifted] shifted continually 48–70 | ~ 72–77
63.29 among] amongst 48–56 | ~ 58–77
63.36 the] that 48–70 | ~ 72–77
64.5 the mind] the Mind 48*72 | mind 77
64.7 not] Want of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
64.10 among] amongst 48–56 | ~ 58–77
64.12 always produce] produce always 48–70 | ~ 72–77
64.16 source] Sources 48*60 | ~ 64–77
64.17 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
64.17 among] amongst 48–56 | ~ 58–77
64.21 observations, which] Observations 48–50 | ~ 56–77
64.33 to those] those 48–50 | ~ 56–77
64.37 wholly] entirely 48–68 | ~ 70–77
64.37 any, with whom we were ever acquainted] any we were ever acquainted with 48–50 | ~ 56–67 | any, with whom we ever were acquainted 68 | ~ 70–77
65.6 much to be suspected] suspicious 48–60 | ~ 64–77
65.11 in the] ~ 48 | the 50 | ~ 56–77
65.12 long] a long 48–50 | ~ 56–77
65.15 men's] Mens 48*70 | ~ 72–77

65.17 our] the 48–58 | ~ 60–77
65.19 experience] Practice and Experience 48*56 | ~ 58–77
65.19 teach] ~ 48–56 | teaches 58–60 | ~ 64–77
65.20 intricacies] Labyrinths and Intricacies 48*56 | ~ 58–77
65.23 pretended to] pretended 48–60 | ~ 64–77
65.26 experiment, which] Experiment 48–50 | experiment which 56*77
65.29 aged] antient 48–60 | ~ 64–77
65.35 carried to] carry'd 48–56 | ~ 58–77
65.36 will] should 48–68 | ~ 70–77
65.36 making any] any 48–68 | ~ 70–77
65.38 found] ~ 48–64 | scarce found 67–68 | ~ 70–77
65.38 no] ~ 48–64 | any 67–68 | ~ 70–77
65.39 conduct] Conduct and Behaviour 48*56 | ~ 58–77
65.40 maxims] Rules and Maxims 48*56 | ~ 58–77
66.4 It is] 'Tis from 48*70 | ~ 72–77
66.12 a uniformity] a Constancy and Uniformity 48–50 | a constancy and uniformity 56 | ~ 58 | an uniformity 60–72 | ~ 77
66.13 observation] Observations 48 | Observation 50*77
66.14 or] nor 48–70 | ~ 72–77
66.15 regular] regular or uniform 48–56 | ~ 58–77
66.19 sentiments,] Sentiments that are 48*68 | ~ 70–77
66.22 uniformity] Constancy and Uniformity 48*56 | ~ 58–77
66.22 An] ~ 48–64 | The 67–68 | ~ 70–77
66.23 aim,] Scope and Aim 48*56 | aim 58*77
66.27 the latter] them 48–50 | ~ 56–77
66.27 impediment] Obstacle nor Impediment 48*56 | ~ 58–77
66.35 opposition] Hindrance and Opposition 48*56 | ~ 58–77
66.37 that it does not commonly] it commonly does not 48–58 | that it commonly does not 60–70 | ~ 72–77
66.37 artist] Artizan 48*68 | ~ 70–77
67.1 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
67.5 expectation] Expectations 48*56 | ~ 58–77
67.6 cause] Causes 48*70 | ~ 72–77
67.7 are] ~ 48–67 | is 68 | ~ 70–77
67.7 are] ~ 48–67 | is 68 | ~ 70–77
67.9 They know] ~ 48–67 | He knows 68 | ~ 70–77
67.14 regularity] Strictness and Regularity 48*56 | ~ 58–77
67.16 reasoning] Reasonings 48*70 | ~ 72–77
67.34 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
67.35 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
67.37 among] amongst 48–56 | ~ 58–77
67.40 to have always] always to have 48–70 | ~ 72–77
68.2 a source, whence we draw *inferences*] the Source of all the *Inferences* we

form 48–50 | the source of all the *inferences*, which we form 56–68 | ~ 70–77
68.8 agent] Actor 48 | Agent 50*77
68.9 ensure him] ensure 48–70 | ~ 72–77
68.11 purchasers] Buyers 48–50 | buyers 56–72 | ~ 77
68.13 men extend their dealings] Mens Dealings are more extensive 48*58 | ~ 60–77
68.14 render their] their 48–58 | ~ 60–77
68.16 the] their 48–70 | ~ 72–77
68.16 to] ~ 48–64 | will 67–68 | ~ 70–77
68.20 that] which 48–72 | ~ 77
68.22 tools, which] Tools 48–50 | ~ 56–77
68.23 surprized] surpriz'd, in the one Case 48*56 | ~ 58–77
68.23 disappointed] disappointed, as in the other 48–56 | ~ 58–77
68.31 that opinion] it 48–50 | ~ 56–77
68.31 speculative] ~ 48–64 | speculative or practical 67–68 | ~ 70–77
68.33 experience, which] Experience 48–50 | ~ 56–77
68.35 uniform] uniform and regular 48–56 | ~ 58–77
68.36 or] nor 48–70 | ~ 72–77
68.38 operation] Operation 48*58 | operations 60–68 | ~ 70–77
68.38 actions] Actions 48*64 | action 67–68 | ~ 70–77
68.38 pretence] Pretext 48*60 | ~ 64–77
69.6 argument] Argument betwixt them 48 | Argument 50*77
69.9 when he considers the obstinacy of the gaoler, as the] from the Obstinacy of the Goaler, as from 48*60 | ~ 64–77
69.15 consent to] ~ 48–64 | permit 67–68 | ~ 70–77
69.18 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
69.23 volition] Volitions 48*70 | ~ 72–77
69.26 Were a man, . . . particular situations.] **This paragraph occurs in 72–77 only.**
69.34 his] his own 72 | ~ 77
70.11 body,] Bodies 48*70 | ~ 72–77
70.15 one] the one 48–56 | ~ 58–77
70.16 scrutiny] Scrutiny and Examination 48*56 | ~ 58–77
70.19 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
70.21 thence apt] apt, from thence, 48*70 | ~ 72–77
70.22 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
70.22 which result] resulting 48–70 | ~ 72–77
70.22 material] material and brute 48–56 | ~ 58–77
70.27 allowed] acknowleged 48*68 | ~ 70–77
70.27 be] thence be 48–70 | ~ 72–77
70.31 sentiment] Sentiments 48*70 | ~ 72–77
70.35 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77

70.35 that] which 48–68 | ~ 70–77
71.3 namely,] *viz*. 48–64 | ~ 67 | namely 68*77
71.4 whether] if 48–50 | ~ 56–77
71.8 conceive] can conceive 48–68 | ~ 70–77
71.10 at] or, at 48–72 | ~ 77
71.10 thenceforth] thenceforward 48 | ~ 50–77
71.14 question] Dispute 48*70 | ~ 72–77
71.15 upon] ~ 48–67 | on 68 | ~ 70–77
71.16 science] our Knowledge, 48–50 | our science, 56 | science, 58*77
71.22 regular] regular and constant 48–56 | ~ 58–77
71.23 one] the one 48–70 | ~ 72–77
71.25 deliberation] Deliberation and Reflection 48*56 | ~ 58–77
n. 18.5 thoughts] Thought 48*56 | ~ 58–77
n. 18.13 intuitive] an intuitive 48–68 | ~ 70–77
72.1 question] Doctrine 48 | Question 50*77
72.8 one] the one 48–72 | ~ 77
72.9 one] the one 48–72 | ~ 77
72.9 by] from 48–70 | ~ 72–77
72.14 one] Body 48*68 | ~ 70–77
72.24 some] and some are 48–68 | ~ 70–77
72.25 advantage] admirable Advantage 48*68 | ~ 70–77
72.28 readily] frankly 48–70 | ~ 72–77
72.30 regular] regular and constant 48–56 | ~ 58–77
72.31 regular] constant 48–56 | ~ 58–77
73.6 disputes] Debates 48–50 | debates 56–72 | ~ 77
73.7 pretence] Pretext 48*60 | ~ 64–77
73.7 to] into 48–70 | ~ 72–77
73.9 that an] an 48–50 | ~ 56–77
73.13 frankly submit] submit frankly 48–70 | ~ 72–77
73.14 of liberty] Liberty 48–50 | ~ 56–77
73.15 morality] Morality and Religion 48*70 | ~ 72–77
73.15 its support.] them. And first, of Necessity. 48 | them. 50 | the support of them. 56–70 | ~ 72–77
73.17 conformably] conformable 48–68 | ~ 70–77
73.19 conjunction] Union and Conjunction 48*56 | ~ 58–77
73.20 at] at the 48–50 | ~ 56–77
73.22 one] ~ 48–56 | man 58–60 | ~ 64–77
73.24 on] ~ 48–50 | in 56–70 | ~ 72–77
73.30 or] ~ 48–64 | and 67–68 | ~ 70–77
74.1 here be] be 48–50 | ~ 56–77
74.2 ascribe] here ascribe 48–50 | ~ 56–77
74.7 on] ~ 48–50 | in 56 | ~ 58–77
74.12 would here] would 48–58 | ~ 58*Er*–77

74.17 character] Characters 48*70 | ~ 72–77
74.21 answerable] responsible 48–56 | ~ 58–77
74.26 crime] Crimes 48 | Crime 50*77
74.27 wise] way 48–60 | ~ 64–77
74.30 actions] evil Actions 48–50 | ~ 56–77
74.33 for] from 48–56 | ~ 58–77
74.34 deliberation] Thought and Deliberation 48*56 | ~ 58–77
74.39 principles] Passions or Principles 48*56 | ~ 58–77
74.39 an] any 48–70 | ~ 72–77
75.7 are] is 48–50 | ~ 56–77
75.7 objects] Object 48–50 | ~ 56–77
75.8 objects] the Objects 48–50 | ~ 56–77
75.8 sentiment] Sentiments 48*70 | ~ 72–77
75.9 indications] Indications or Proofs 48*56 | ~ 58–77
75.10 that they] they 48–50 | ~ 56–77
75.12 violence] Force and Violence 48*56 | ~ 58–77
75.24 either can] can either 48–50 | ~ 56–77
75.24 moral turpitude] Turpitude 48*56 | ~ 58–77
75.25 have] can have 48–50 | ~ 56–77
75.25 turpitude] moral Turpitude 48*56 | ~ 58–77
75.29 is fixed] are fix'd 48–56 | are fixed 58–70 | are affixed 72 | ~ 77
75.30 produces] ~ 48–64 | produce 67 | ~ 68–77
75.31 belong] belongs 48–56 | ~ 58–77
75.32 clear and] clearest and most 48–70 | ~ 72–77
75.33 any human] ~ 48–67 | human 68 | ~ 70–77
75.39 therefore conclude] conclude, therefore 48–68 | ~ 70–77
76.1 accountable] responsible 48–56 | ~ 58–77
76.5 as] that 48–68 | ~ 70–77
76.6 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
76.9 perfection] Goodness and Perfection 48*56 | ~ 58–77
76.11 laudable] right 48–56 | ~ 58–77
76.11 Or,] Or 48–72 | ~ 77
76.12 the attribute of perfection] those Attributes of Goodness and Perfection 48*56 | ~ 58–77
76.18 benevolence] Benevolence and Goodness 48*56 | ~ 58–77
76.19 all] every 48–68 | ~ 70–77
76.19 beings] Being 48*68 | ~ 70–77
76.26 under which they laboured] they labour'd under 48–50 | under which they labour'd 56*77
76.33 sinews and nerves] Nerves and Sinews 48*70 | ~ 72–77
76.39 object] Object 48 | Objects 50*70 | ~ 72–77
77.1 beings] Objects 48 | Beings 50*77
77.3 ill. It cannot] Ill; nor can it 48–50 | ~ 56–77

77.5 one] the one 48–50 | ~ 56–77
77.7 feels] ~ 48–50 | sees 56 | ~ 58–77
77.8 emotions] Feelings or Emotions 48*56 | ~ 58–77
77.9 our] its 48–68 | ~ 70–77
77.11 public] its 48–50 | ~ 56–77
77.12 it] we 48–68 | ~ 70–77
77.12 be presumed] presume 48–68 | ~ 70–77
77.21 any wise] a whit 48–50 | any way 56–64 | ~ 67–77
77.24 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
77.26 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
77.27 in] on 48–50 | ~ 56–77
77.28 or] ~ 48–56 | nor 58–70 | ~ 72–77
77.34 she] it 48–70 | ~ 72–77
77.34 she] it 48–70 | ~ 72–77
77.34 herself] itself 48–70 | ~ 72–77
77.35 which she] it 48–50 | which it 56–70 | ~ 72–77
77.39 power] Skill 48*70 | ~ 72–77
78.3 enow] ~ 48–50 | enough 56 | ~ 58–77
78.4 doubt, uncertainty, and contradiction] Doubts, Uncertainties and Contradictions 48*58 | ~ 60–77

Section 9

79.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
79.10 degree] Degrees 48*70 | ~ 72–77
79.11 species of reasoning] Species of Reasoning 48*64 | reasoning 67–68 | ~ 70–77
79.12 clearly proved] prov'd clearly 48*70 | ~ 72–77
79.13 one creature] one Creature 48*64 | a particular species 67–68 | ~ 70–77
79.14 all] all of them 48–50 | ~ 56–64 | the others 67–68 | ~ 70–77
79.20 we have, in the foregoing discourse] in the foregoing Essays, we have 48*56 | in the foregoing discourse, we have 58–70 | ~ 72–77
79.28 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
79.29 are] is 48–50 | ~ 56–77
79.31 gave] ~ 48–60 | give 64 | ~ 67–68 | give 70 | ~ 72–77
80.2 meet] ~ 48–64 | meet with 67–68 | ~ 70–77
80.3 in] on 48–50 | ~ 56–77
80.5 on] on all 48–50 | ~ 56–77
80.17 consequences] Events 48*70 | ~ 72–77
80.30 more] ~ 48–64 | a more 67–68 | ~ 70–77
80.33 reasoning] Reasoning 48*67 | reason 68 | ~ 70–77
80.35 in the] in 48–50 | ~ 56–77

80.40 particular] strong and lively 48–70 | ~ 72–77
81.2 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 20 **Note 20 occurs from 50 to 77.**
n. 20.1 reasoning] Reasonings 50 | reasonings 56–64 | ~ 67–68 | reasonings 70–77
n. 20.5 between] betwixt 50–58 | ~ 60–77
n. 20.23 forming of] forming 50–70 | ~ 72–77
81.5 much] must 48 | ~ 50–77
81.6 in which] ~ 48 | on which 50 | ~ 50*Er*–77

Section 10

10.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
83.3 so] that is so 48–68 | ~ 70–77
83.5 in] on 48–50 | ~ 56–77
83.11 rest such confidence in] be so certain of the Truth of 48*68 | ~ 70–77
83.11 in] of 48–68 | ~ 70–77
83.11 object] Objects 48–50 | objects 56 | ~ 58–68 | objects 70–72 | ~ 77
83.13 the] ~ 48–67 | a 68 | ~ 70–77
83.21 us] one 48–50 | ~ 56–77
83.25 history, sacred and profane] prophane History 48–50 | history, sacred and prophane 56*77
83.29 errors] Errors and Mistakes 48–50 | errors and mistakes 56–72 | ~ 77
83.31 conformably] conformable 48–67 | ~ 68–77
84.5 like] a like 48–50 | ~ 56–77
84.16 greater] greatest 48–72 | ~ 77
84.22 doubtful] very doubtful 48–68 | ~ 70–77
84.23 a] ~ 48–67 | an 68 | ~ 70–77
84.23 that is contradictory,] contradictory one, does 48–50 | contradictory one, 56 | ~ 58–77
84.24 pretty] very 48 | ~ 50–77
84.25 smaller] lesser 48–56 | ~ 58–77
84.30 which is derived] deriv'd 48*70 | ~ 72–77
84.37 inferences, which] Inferences 48*50 | ~ 56–77
84.39 evident, that] evident 48–50 | evident that 56 | ~ 58–77
85.2 event] Events 48*70 | ~ 72–77
85.2 Were not the memory tenacious to a certain degree; had not men] Did not Mens Imagination naturally follow their Memory; had they not 48*56 | ~ 58–77
85.4 principle] Sentiment 48*56 | ~ 58–77
85.8 authority] Weight or Authority 48*56 | ~ 58–77
85.11 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
85.12 object] Objects 48*70 | ~ 72–77

85.14 the] our 48–50 | ~ 56–77
85.18 argument] Arguments 48*70 | ~ 72–77
85.20 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
85.29 doubtful] suspicious 48–72 | ~ 77
85.30 hesitation] Doubt and Hesitation 48–50 | doubt and hesitation 56–72 | ~ 77
85.36 admits of] receives 48–56 | admits 58–60 | ~ 64–77
85.38 derived from] from 48–68 | ~ 70–77
85.38 *connexion*, which] *Connexion* 48–50 | ~ 56–77
85.39 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
86.1 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
86.8 arises] ~ 48–56 | arise 58–68 | ~ 70–77
86.10 *I should not* . . . an authority.] **This paragraph occurs only from 56 to 77.**
n. 21 **Note 21 occurs from 56 to 77.**
86.14 The INDIAN prince, . . . conformable to it.] **This paragraph occurs only from 50 to 77.**
86.16 that] which 50–67 | ~ 68–77
86.17 which bore] bore 50–64 | ~ 67–68 | bore 70 | ~ 72–77
n. 22 **Note 22 occurs from 50 to 77. A note was appended at the end of 50 (p. 260) with the following printed explanation:**

> The Distance of the Author from the Press is the Cause, why the following Passage arriv'd not in time to be inserted in its proper Place.

n. 22.12 fluid] liquid 50–60 | ~ 64–77
86.26 unalterable] inalterable 48–50 | ~ 56–77
87.7 seemingly in] in seeming 48–68 | ~ 70–77
87.7 on] of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
87.15 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 23.11 *interposition*] *Interposal* 48*58 | ~ 60–77
87.17 attention),] Attention) 48–50 | attention) 56–72 | ~ 77
87.25 fact, which he relates,] Fact he relates 48–50 | fact which he relates, 56*77
88.5 real] kind of 48–70 | ~ 72–77
88.6 concession] Concessions 48–50 | concessions 56–72 | ~ 77
88.7 event] Event, *in any History*, 48–50 | event, 56*77
88.13 of their] of 48–70 | ~ 72–77
88.19 which we might, from human testimony, have] we might have, from Human Testimony 48–50 | which we might have, from human testimony 56–70 | ~ 72–77
88.24 an] any 48–56 | ~ 58–77
88.24 as] of them as 48–68 | ~ 70–77
88.26 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–64 | that 67–68 | ~ 70–77

88.27 an] ~ 48–64 | any 67–68 | ~ 70–77
88.29 of such] such 48–72 | ~ 77
89.9 narrative] Narration 48–50 | narration 56–72 | ~ 77
89.11 no] ~ 48–72 | not 77
89.19 at] in 48–68 | ~ 70–77
89.22 Tully] *Cicero* 48*70 | ~ 72–77
89.22 effect] operate 48–70 | ~ 72–77
89.25 vulgar passions.] **A note occurs at this point from 48 to 68 that occurs as text from 70 to 77.**
89.26 The many instances . . . religious miracles?] **This paragraph occurs as a footnote from 48 to 68 and as text from 70 to 77.**
89.28 prove] mark 48–68 | ~ 70–77
89.34 marriages] Marriages 48*68 | marriage 70 | ~ 72–77
89.34 that] as 48–50 | ~ 50*Er*–77
89.39 find] finds 48–70 | ~ 72–77
90.2 believe and report] the believing and reporting 48–70 | ~ 72–77
90.4 strong] very strong 48–70 | ~ 72–77
90.5 observed] always found 48–50 | observ'd 56*77
90.5 among] amongst 48–56 | ~ 58–77
90.9 attend received] attends antient and receiv'd 48–56 | attend antient and received 58 | ~ 60–77
90.13 pestilence, famine, and death] Pestilences, Famines, and Deaths 48 | Pestilences, Famines, and Death 50*70 | ~ 72–77
90.13 effects] Effects 48–50 | ~ 56–70 | effect 72–77
90.15 obscure] obscure and over-shadow 48–56 | ~ 58–77
90.16 the former] these 48 | those 50 | ~ 56–77
90.17 ages] Ages of Science and Knowledge 48*68 | ~ 70–77
90.19 marvellous] Marvellous and Extraordinary 48*56 | ~ 58–77
90.20 be thoroughly] ~ 48 | thoroughly be 50–70 | ~ 72–77
90.25 marvellous] prodigious 48–50 | ~ 56–77
90.29 in] on 48–50 | ~ 56–77
90.31 a wise] ~ 48–64 | wise 67 | ~ 68–77
90.31 false prophet] cunning Impostor 48*68 | ~ 70–77
90.33 the people] the People 48*64 | men 67–68 | ~ 70–77
90.35 worth] ~ 48–60 | worthy 64–67 | ~ 68–77
90.37 in propagating] to propagate 48–72 | ~ 77
90.38 imposture] Delusion 48*70 | ~ 72–77
90.40 impostor] Impostor 48–50 | ~ 56–67 | imposture 68 | ~ 70 | imposture 72 | ~ 77
91.2 among] amongst 48–56 | ~ 58–77
91.9 for] of 48–68 | ~ 70–77
91.12 a large] large enough 48–70 | ~ 72–77
91.12 and] ~ 48–67 | or 68 | ~ 70–77

91.14 story, which is universally exploded in the place where it was first started, shall pass for certain at a thousand miles distance] Story shall pass for certain at a thousand Miles Distance, which is universally exploded in the Place where it was first started 48*56 | ~ 58–77

91.18 throughout] thro' 48–67 | through 68–72 | ~ 77

91.23 his impostures.] **The following note occurs at this point from 48 to 68:**

> It may here, perhaps, be objected, that I proceed rashly, and form my Notions of *Alexander* merely from the Account, given of him by *Lucian*, a profess'd Enemy. It were indeed to be wish'd, that some of the Accounts publish'd by his Followers and Accomplices had remain'd. The Opposition and Contrast betwixt {betwixt 48–58 | between 60–68} the Character and Conduct of the same Man, as drawn by a Friend or an Enemy is as strong, even in common Life, much more in these religious Matters, as that betwixt any two Men in the World, betwixt *Alexander* and St. *Paul*, for Instance. See a Letter to *Gilbert West* Esq; on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. *Paul*.

91.28 of the] ~ 48–72 | of 77

91.28 the] even the 48–68 | ~ 70–77

91.34 miracles),] Miracles) 48–50 | miracles) 56–72 | ~ 77

91.35 has it] it has 48–56 | ~ 58–77

91.39 of] ~ 48–68 | to 70 | ~ 72–77

92.1 any] ~ 48–64 | a 67–68 | ~ 70–77

92.1 his] any of his 48–70 | ~ 72–77

92.2 hand] side 48–56 | ~ 58–77

92.5 miracle] Miracles 48*68 | ~ 70–77

92.8 miracle] Miracles 48*68 | ~ 70–77

92.17 a] ~ 48–67 | the 68 | ~ 70–77

92.18 miraculous] miraculous and extraordinary 48–68 | ~ 70–77

n. 24.1 4] {SBN, TXT} | 4 48–50 | 5 56–68 | v 70–77

n. 24.1 Suetonius gives . . . Vesp.] **This sentence occurs in 50*Er*–77.**

n. 24.1 81. Suetonius gives nearly] {SBN} | 8. 48–50 | 8. *Suetonius* gives 50*Er*–56 | 8. Suetonius gives 58–60 | 8. Suetonius gives nearly 64–77

92.24 manner] Way 48*60 | ~ 64–77

92.26 cotemporary] contemporary 48–50 | ~ 56–77

92.28 credulity] Superstition and Credulity 48*68 | ~ 70–77

92.30 authority] Testimony 48*70 | ~ 72–77

92.31 presume] suppose 48–56 | ~ 58–77

92.32 testimony] Verdict 48*70 | ~ 72–77

92.32 was] were 48–70 | ~ 72–77

92.34 mendacio] *mendacis* 48 | *mendacio* 50–77

92.35 facts] Fact 48 | Facts 50*77

92.35 as related] ~ 48 | related 50–56 | ~ 56***Er***–77
92.38 memorable] very memorable 48–68 | ~ 70–77
92.38 which] and which 48–70 | ~ 72–77
93.3 cathedral] Cathedral Church 48*56 | ~ 58–77
93.4 seven] twenty 48–60 | ~ 64–77
93.4 door-keeper] Door-keeper of the Church 48*56 | ~ 58–77
93.5 his] their 48–70 | ~ 72–77
93.5 church] Cathedral 48*56 | ~ 58–77
93.7 the cardinal assures us that he saw him with two legs] when the Cardinal examin'd it, he found it to be a true natural Leg, like the other 48–50 | ~ 56–77
93.9 were] was 48 | ~ 50–77
93.11 cotemporary] contemporary 48–50 | ~ 56–77
93.12 genius;] Genius, 48–50 | genius, 56–72 | ~ 77
93.13 scarcely] scarce 48–68 | ~ 70–77
93.24 cunning,] Cunning, 48–50 | ~ 56 | cunning 58–72 | ~ 77
93.26 face of it] Face of it 48 | Face it 50*56 | ~ 56***Er***–77
93.29 a greater] so great a 48–68 | ~ 70–77
93.30 than] as 48–68 | ~ 70–77
n. 25 **Note 25 occurs from 50 to 77. The sentences from n. 25.63 through n. 25.78 (as marked below) occur only from 56 to 77.**
n. 25.1 writ] wrote 50–70 | ~ 72–77
n. 25.1 Montgeron] *de Montgiron* 50*67 | ~ 70–77
n. 25.6 written] wrote 50–68 | writ 70–72 | ~ 77
n. 25.6 between] betwixt 50–58 | ~ 60–77
n. 25.12 other] others 50–68 | ~ 70–77
n. 25.15 at] of 50–60 | ~ 64–77
n. 25.15 eye] Eyes 50 | ~ 56–77
n. 25.17 in] ~ 50–60 | to 64–68 | ~ 70–77
n. 25.23 Jansenist] *Jansenists* 50–56 | Jansenists 58–68 | Jansenists' 70–72 | ~ 77
n. 25.26 miracle.] Miracles. 50 | Miracle. 50***Er****77
n. 25.26 parliament. But the parliament] Parliament, who 50 | ~ 56–77
n. 25.27 forbid] ~ 50–72 | forbidden 77
n. 25.32 reputation] great Reputation 50*68 | ~ 70–77
n. 25.36 could] ~ 50–64 | should 67–68 | ~ 70–77
n. 25.47 produced] operated 50–70 | ~ 72–77
n. 25.57 more] ~ 50–67 | so 68 | ~ 70–77
n. 25.58 testimony] such Testimony 50*60 | ~ 64–77
n. 25.62 niece] Sister 50 | Niece 50***Er****77
n. 25.62 known. The famous . . . which, *&c.*] known; tho' *he* also was a Believer, in that and in many other Miracles, which he had less Opportunity of being inform'd of. See his Life. 50 | ~ 56–77

n. 25.67 the Port-Royal] *Port-Royal* 56 | ~ 58–77
n. 25.74 often] oft 56–72 | ~ 77
n. 25.76 that miracle] it 56 | ~ 58–77
n. 25.78 crown, which] ~ 56–67 | crown, 68 | ~ 70–77
95.2 battle] Battles 48*70 | ~ 72–77
95.4 that the] the 48–50 | ~ 56–77
95.5 claimed] challeng'd 48–50 | claim'd 56*77
95.6 that the] the 48–50 | ~ 56–77
95.8 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
95.8 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
95.9 delivered] related 48–50 | deliver'd 56*77
95.12 passion] Passion 48*64 | passions 67–68 | ~ 70–77
96.1 in order to] to 48–50 | ~ 56–77
96.3 himself,] ~ 48–50 | himself 56–64 | ~ 67–68 | himself 70–72 | ~ 77
n. 26 **Note 26 occurs from 50 to 77.**
96.6 the gazing populace, receive] swallow 48–56 | the gazing populace receive 58*77
96.15 a recourse] Recourse 48–50 | ~ 56–67 | recourse 68 | ~ 70–77
96.16 most established] most known and most establish'd 48–50 | most establish'd 56*77
96.18 place] Time and Place 48*70 | ~ 72–77
96.18 when] where 48–70 | ~ 72–77
96.21 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
96.24 part] party 48–70 | ~ 72–77
96.28 past] gone 48–68 | ~ 70–77
96.29 which] who 48–50 | that 56 | ~ 58–77
96.30 remain] ~ 48–56 | remains 58 | ~ 60–77
96.35 has ever amounted] can ever possibly amount 48–50 | ~ 56–77
97.3 one] the one 48–50 | ~ 56–77
97.9–21 I beg the . . . might be derived.] **These sentences occur as the opening portion of a footnote from 48 to 68. Note 27 in the present text was attached to the end of the footnote as it appeared from 58 to 68. (See also 97.21–25 below.)**
97.9 limitations] Limitation 48 | Limitations 50*77
97.20 the] of that 48–60 | that 64–72 | ~ 77
97.20 as] for 48–67 | ~ 68 | for 70 | ~ 72–77
97.21–25 The decay, . . . extensive and uniform.] **This sentence, which immediately follows the sentences at 97.9–21, does not occur in 48–50. It occurs as the last sentence in the first paragraph in the footnote from 56 to 68 (see 97.9–21 above for the earlier portion of the paragraph) and as text from 70–77.**
97.26–98.38 But suppose, . . . may be covered.] **These two paragraphs occur as the second and third paragraphs of a footnote from 48 to 68 (see 97.9–21 & 97.21–25 above) and as text from 70 to 77.**

97.30 being] having been 48–50 | ~ 56–77
97.31 resumed] took Possession of 48–50 | took possession of 56–72 | ~ 77
97.32 confess that] confess 48–56 | confess, 58–72 | ~ 77
97.38 solid judgment] Integrity 48*68 | ~ 70–77
97.39 which she] she 48–50 | ~ 56–77
98.2 arise] ~ 48–50 | rise 56 | ~ 58–77
98.2 than] ~ 48–67 | than to 68 | ~ 70–77
98.3 of so signal] so single 48 | so signal 50–70 | ~ 72–77
98.13 violations] Violations 48*72 | violation 77
98.20 pretence] Pretext 48*70 | ~ 72–77
98.21 Lord] My Lord 56*68 | ~ 70–77
98.22 "We ought, . . . falsehood and fable."] **This quotation does not occur in 48–50. The quotation occurs in Latin in footnotes from 56 to 68 (in italics in 56 and in quotation marks in 58–68), in Latin in the text in 70, and in English in the text from 72 to 77. The Latin in 56 reads:**

> *Facienda enim est congeries sive historia naturalis particularis omnium monstrorum & partuum naturae prodigiosorum; omnis denique novitatis & raritatis & inconsueti in natura. Hoc vero faciendum est cum severissimo delectu, ut constet fides. Maxime autem habenda sunt pro suspectis quae pendent quomodocunque ex religione, ut prodigia Livii: Nec minus quae inveniuntur in scriptoribus magiae naturalis, aut etiam alchymiae, & hujusmodi hominibus; qui tanquam proci sunt & amatores fabularum.*

n. 27 **Note 27 occurs from 56 to 77. The reference is positioned from 56 to 68 at the end of an expository note that occurs as text from 70 to 77 (see 98.21–29).**
98.30 the] this 48–68 | ~ 70–77
98.30 reasoning here delivered] Reasoning 48*68 | ~ 70–77
98.38 according to the principles of these pretended CHRISTIANS] as these pretended Christians would have us 48–50 | ~ 56–77
99.3 written] wrote 48–68 | writ 70–72 | ~ 77
99.4 which it relates,] it relates; 48–50 | which it relates; 56–72 | ~ 77
99.13 serious] ~ 48–72 | a serious 77
99.16 be received] be receiv'd 48–50 | receiv'd 56 | ~ 58–77
99.22 an argument for] a Proof of 48 | an Argument for 50*77

Section 11

100.*Ttl* SECTION 11 Of a Particular Providence and of a Future State] ESSAY XI. *Of the* PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES *of* NATURAL RELIGION. 48 | ESSAY XI. *Of a* PARTICULAR PROVIDENCE *and of a* FUTURE STATE. 50*56 | SECTION XI. OF A PARTICULAR PROVIDENCE *and of a* FUTURE STATE. 58*77

100.2 of which] which 48–50 | ~ 56–77
100.3 approve] approve of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
100.3 to bear] bear 48–50 | ~ 56–77
100.4 throughout this enquiry] thro' these Essays 48*58 | thro' this enquiry 58*Er**68 | ~ 70–77
100.9 chiefly flourishes] flourishes chiefly 48*70 | ~ 72–77
100.14 scarcely] scarce 48–68 | ~ 70–77
100.15 jealousy] Jealousy and Persecution 48*56 | ~ 58–77
100.18 the established] their 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 29.1 Lucian.] Id. 48–70 | Luciani 72–77
100.21 her early youth] its first Origin 48*70 | ~ 72–77
100.22 she] it 48–70 | ~ 72–77
100.23 she] it 48–70 | ~ 72–77
100.25 her] it 48–70 | ~ 72–77
100.30 interest] Interest 48*64 | interests 67–68 | ~ 70–77
100.31 dogmas] Dogmas and Principles 48*56 | ~ 58–77
101.4 apprehension] Apprehension 48*64 | apprehensions 67–68 | ~ 70–77
101.4 of such tales chiefly] chiefly of such Tales and Stories 48*56 | chiefly of such tales 58–70 | ~ 72–77
101.7 these teachers seem] they seem, 48–50 | these teachers seem, 56*77
101.8 superstition] Superstitions 48*70 | ~ 72–77
101.9 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
101.10 wise, the latter] the Wise, and latter 48 | the Wise, and the latter 50 | the wise, and the latter 56–70 | wise, and the latter 72 | ~ 77
101.12 say] says 48–70 | ~ 72–77
101.19 from] any 48–68 | ~ 70–77
101.23 proved] prov'd 48*64 | have proved 67–68 | ~ 70–77
101.25 expose] subject 48–50 | ~ 56–77
101.26 said] says 48–50 | ~ 56–77
101.33 deliver] give 48–56 | ~ 58–77
101.38 and I] and 48–64 | ~ 67 | and 68–70 | ~ 72–77
102.1 interest] Interest 48*64 | interests 67–68 | ~ 70–77
102.7 that you] you 48–50 | ~ 56–77
102.10 The] Your 48–50 | The 56*77
102.11 tradition] Tradition 48*56 | traditions 58–70 | ~ 72–77
102.12 doctrine] Doctrines 48*70 | ~ 72–77
102.12 acquiesce),] acquiesce) 48–72 | ~ 77
102.17 intelligence] Intelligence and Wisdom 48*56 | ~ 58–77
102.19 greatest] highest 48–70 | ~ 72–77
102.24 society] Society and Government 48*56 | ~ 58–77
102.29 appear] appears 48–50 | ~ 50*Er*–77
102.32 From the order of the work, you infer] You infer, from the Order of the Work 48–50 | From the order of the work, you infer 56*77

103.11 ascribe] assign 48–70 | ~ 72–77
103.15 that] whether 48–50 | ~ 56–77
103.18 to be] was 48–50 | ~ 56–77
103.22 for producing] to produce 48–70 | ~ 72–77
103.26 appears] appear 48–50 | ~ 56–77
103.31 regions of space or periods of] Periods of Place and 48*70 | ~ 72–77
103.33 scheme] Scheme or Order 48*56 | ~ 58–77
103.37 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
103.39 refer to] point towards 48–58 | ~ 60–77
104.2 that you] you 48–50 | ~ 56–77
104.6 are] is 48–50 | ~ 56–77
104.14 silver] a Silver 48*68 | ~ 70–77
104.14 state] Scene 48*70 | ~ 72–77
104.17 I pay them not, I own,] I own, I pay them not 48–50 | ~ 56–77
104.20 affirm, that] affirm 48–50 | affirm that 56*77
104.22 by the gradual ascent] Scale 48 | by the gradual Ascent 50*77
104.23 ascent] Scale 48 | Ascent 50*77
104.30 the ill] the 48 | ~ 50–77
105.8 the] these 48–50 | ~ 56–77
105.10 the existence of these causes] their Existence 48–50 | ~ 56–77
105.14 as] for 48–72 | ~ 77
105.16 have certainly] must certainly have 48–68 | ~ 70–77
105.18 in order to] which might 48–50 | ~ 56–77
105.33 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
105.36 tell me, indeed] indeed tell me 48 | ~ 50–77
105.40 experience of past] past Experience of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
106.2 reward] Favour 48–50 | ~ 56–77
106.5 you] ~ 48–68 | we 70 | ~ 72–77
106.14 think] judge 48–70 | ~ 72–77
106.15 present] present Life and the present 48–50 | ~ 56–77
106.16 this life] it 48–50 | ~ 56–77
106.18 only] merely 48 | ~ 50–77
106.23 be endowed with] possess 48–70 | ~ 72–77
106.32 justice, in our sense of it,] Justice 48*60 | ~ 64–77
106.32 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
106.37 to theirs] theirs 48–60 | ~ 64–77
107.1 understanding] Understandings 48*68 | ~ 70–77
107.1 those] these 48 | ~ 50–77
107.1 boundaries] Bounds 48*56 | ~ 58–77
107.2 imagination] Imagination 48 | Imaginations 50*68 | ~ 70–77
107.3 bestowed] bestow'd 48*67 | established 68 | ~ 70–77
107.8 the] any 48–50 | ~ 56–77
107.8 inference] Inferences 48*70 | ~ 72–77

107.11 said] says 48–70 | ~ 72–77
107.12 were] was 48–70 | ~ 72–77
107.16 our] your 48 | ~ 50–77
107.17 but, from the very same experience, to which you appeal, it may be possible] but it may be possible, from the very same Experience you appeal to, 48–50 | ~ 56–77
107.20 brick] Bricks 48–50 | ~ 56–77
107.20 stone] Stones 48–50 | ~ 56–77
107.24 further] farther 48–72 | ~ 77
107.33 point] Period 48*70 | ~ 72–77
107.34 similar] parallel 48–72 | ~ 77
107.34 pretence] Pretext, 48*60 | ~ 64–77
107.37 conclusions] Arguments and Conclusions 48*56 | ~ 58–77
107.39 to form] form 48–60 | ~ 64–77
108.8 in] on 48–60 | ~ 64–77
108.13 inference] Inferences 48*64 | ~ 67–68 | inferences 70 | ~ 72–77
108.23 fallacious] altogether fallacious 48–56 | ~ 58–77
108.30 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
108.33 from] ~ 48–60 | for 64 | ~ 67–77
108.36 A more] More 48–64 | ~ 67–68 | More 70 | ~ 72–77
108.37 greater] superior 48–70 | ~ 72–77
108.39 entirely] altogether 48–56 | ~ 58 | intirely 60*77
n. 31 **Note 31 occurs in this form from 56 to 77. Part of this note is positioned as text in 48–50.**
n. 31.13 that it] it 48–50 | ~ 56–77
109.10 rules] Rules 48–50 | rule 56–70 | ~ 72–77
109.11 men] Men 48*64 | man 67–68 | ~ 70–77
109.12 coherence] Consistency and Coherence 48*56 | ~ 58–77
109.13 fact] Facts 48*70 | ~ 72–77
109.13 intention] Aim or Intention 48*56 | ~ 58–77
109.16 can never] never can 48–70 | ~ 72–77
109.16 have] take 48–50 | ~ 56–77
109.17 much less] less 48–58 | ~ 60–77
109.22 of it] it 48–70 | ~ 72–77
109.27 measures] different Measures 48*56 | ~ 58–77
109.27 different from] from 48–56 | ~ 58–77
110.8 deny] still deny 48–68 | ~ 70–77
110.13 appear] appears 48–50 | ~ 56–77
110.16 attempt] ~ 48–56 | may attempt 58 | ~ 60–77
110.19 society] Equity and Society 48*56 | ~ 58–77
110.23 that the] the 48–56 | ~ 58–77
110.24 that] of 48–50 | ~ 56–77

110.24 government has suffered] Government's suffering 48–50 | government has suffer'd 56*77
110.29 where] wherein 48–50 | ~ 56–77
111.2 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
111.6 reflection] Reflections 48*70 | ~ 72–77
111.6 pursue] prosecute 48–58 | ~ 60–77
111.12 on the latter, or any addition to it] on, or Addition to, the latter 48*50 | ~ 56–77

Section 12

112.*Ttl* SECTION] ESSAY 48–56 | ~ 58–77
112.2 those, which] those to 48–50 | ~ 56–77
112.6 and] ~ 48–67 | and of 68 | ~ 70–77
112.6 with regard to] concerning 48–56 | ~ 58–77
112.9 certain, that no man] certain no one 48–50 | certain, that no one 56 | ~ 58–77
112.23 those] ~ 48–56 | these 58–60 | ~ 64–77
112.24 are] ~ 48–67 | were 68 | ~ 70–77
112.26 entirely] altogether 48–56 | ~ 58–77
112.31 mind] Minds 48*56 | ~ 58–77
113.4 these] this 48–68 | ~ 70–77
113.5 are] is 48–50 | ~ 56–77
113.5 methods] Method 48–50 | ~ 56–77
113.8 when] where 48–70 | ~ 72–77
113.11 a certain] this 48–50 | ~ 56–77
113.13 and] ~ 48–67 | or 68 | ~ 70–77
113.14 tenets] so 48–50 | ~ 56–77
113.19 which are derived] deriv'd 48*70 | ~ 72–77
113.22 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
113.23 eye] Eye with the Finger 48 | Eye 50*77
113.23 a] ~ 48 | the 50–56 | ~ 58–77
113.23 These] ~ 48–64 | The 67 | ~ 68–77
114.4 does not annihilate it] annihilates it not 48–70 | ~ 72–77
114.9 only the] ~ 48–67 | the only 68 | ~ 70–77
114.10 conveyed] receiv'd 48*70 | ~ 72–77
114.10 able] ever able 48–68 | ~ 70–77
114.10 any immediate] ~ 48–50 | any 56 | ~ 58–77
114.11 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
114.11 table, which] Table 48–50 | ~ 56 | table which 58*77
114.19 contradict or depart from] depart from, or contradict 48–50 | ~ 56–77
114.20 to embrace] embrace 48–56 | ~ 58–77

114.21 evidence] Evidence 48*58 | evidences 60 | ~ 64–77
114.21 herself] itself 48–70 | ~ 72–77
114.22 she] it 48–70 | ~ 72–77
114.23 She] It 48–70 | ~ 72–77
114.29 from them] from 48–50 | ~ 56–77
114.37 contrary a] ~ 48–64 | a contrary 67–68 | ~ 70–77
115.3 connexion] Connexion 48*72 | motion 77 **As the catchword in 77 indicates, 'motion' is probably a compositor's mistake for 'nexion'.**
115.7 this] ~ 48–67 | the 68 | ~ 70–77
115.8 possible that] possible 48–50 | ~ 56–77
115.9 question] doubt 48–70 | ~ 72–77
115.12 is a topic, therefore] therefore is a Topic 48–50 | ~ 56–77
115.17 this principle] this 48–56 | ~ 58–77
115.18 opinion] Principle 48*56 | ~ 58–77
115.25 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
115.26 so little serve to] serve so little 48–70 | ~ 72–77
115.26 purpose] Purpose or Intention 48*56 | ~ 58–77
115.29 of] in 48–50 | ~ 56–77
115.38 an opinion, which] which 48–70 | ~ 72–77
115.39 examine it] examine 48–70 | ~ 72–77
116.4 or] nor 48–70 | ~ 72–77
n. 32.1 very ingenious] ingenious 48 | ~ 50–77
n. 32.4 his] ~ 48 | the 50 | ~ 56–77
n. 32.6 appears] appears evidently 48 | ~ 50–77
116.13 Bereave matter . . . against it.] **This sentence occurs in 77 only.**
116.19 is this] this is 48–50 | ~ 56–77
116.22 ideas] Nature 48*56 | ~ 58–77
116.23 time; ideas] Time 48–50 | time, ideas 56*77
116.23 are] seem 48–50 | ~ 56–77
116.25 principles, which seem] Principles and Notions 48–50 | principles which seem 56*77
116.29 its] all its 48 | ~ 50–77
n. 33.3 indivisible] ~ 48–56 | invisible 58–64 | ~ 67–77
n. 33.7 divisible.] divisible? 48–56 | ~ 58–77
117.7 seemingly absurd] absurd 48–50 | ~ 56–77
117.7 reasoning] Reason 48 | Reasoning 50*77
117.8 is it] does it seem 48–50 | ~ 56–77
117.12 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
117.15 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
117.16 between] betwixt 48–56 | ~ 58–77
117.22 on which she treads] she treads on 48–50 | on which he treads 56–60 | ~ 64–77

117.24 between] betwixt 48–58 | ~ 60–77
117.25 scarcely] scarce 48–68 | ~ 70–77
117.27 seems to become] becomes 48–50 | ~ 56–77
117.30 appears] is 48–50 | ~ 56–77
117.34 driven] led 48–70 | ~ 72–77
117.34 these seeming] these 48–50 | ~ 56–77
118.5 paradoxical] absurd 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 34.6 usually] us'd to be 48*68 | ~ 70–77
n. 34.6 colours, figures] Figures 48 | Colours, Figures 50*77
n. 34.9 as] ~ 48–67 | as it 68 | ~ 70–77
n. 34.11 divisible.] divisible. In general, we may pronounce, that the Ideas of *greater*, *less*, or *equal*, which are the chief Objects of Geometry, are far from being so exact or determinate as to be the Foundation of such extraordinary Inferences. Ask a Mathematician what he means, when he pronounces two Quantities to be equal, and he must say, that the Idea of *Equality* is one of those, which cannot be defin'd, and that 'tis sufficient to place two equal Quantities before any one, in order to suggest it. Now this is an Appeal to the general Appearances {Appearances 48 | Appearance 50 | Appearances 56–77} of Objects to the Imagination or Senses, and consequently can never afford Conclusions so directly contrary to these Faculties. 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 34.13 conclusions] absurd Conclusions 48–50 | ~ 56–77
118.8 fact,] Fact 48–50 | fact 56–67 | ~ 68 | fact 70–72 | ~ 77
118.20 These principles] They 48–50 | ~ 56–77
118.24 determined] determin'd 48*67 | determinate 68 | ~ 70–77
118.26 within] in 48–64 | ~ 67–68 | in 70–72 | ~ 77
119.4 argument] Arguments 48*70 | ~ 72–77
119.9 may] may also 48 | ~ 50–77
119.12 at] at a 48–50 | ~ 56–77
119.17 *these*] ~ 48–67 | *those* 68 | ~ 70–77
119.17 loss] stand 48–50 | ~ 56–77
119.21 an effect] a mighty Effect 48–50 | a mighty effect 56–64 | a mighty influence 67–68 | a mighty effect 70–72 | ~ 77
119.22 expect,] propose, 48–58 | propose 60–68 | propose, 70–72 | ~ 77
119.24 must] must immediately 48–50 | ~ 56–77
119.26 would] must 48–50 | wou'd 56*77
119.32 will] will immediately 48–50 | ~ 56–77
119.34 in] with 48 | ~ 50–77
119.37 amusement] Amusements 48*64 | ~ 67–68 | amusements 70 | ~ 72–77
119.37 show] show us 48 | ~ 50–77
120.1 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
120.6 greater] greatest 48–72 | ~ 77

120.9 counterpoising argument] counterbalancing Arguments 48–50 | counterpoizing arguments 56*64 | ~ 67–68 | counterpoising arguments 70 | ~ 72–77
120.10 to which they are inclined] which they are inclin'd to 48–50 | to which they are inclin'd 56*77
120.11 understanding] Understanding 48*56 | understandings 58–64 | ~ 67–68 | understandings 70 | ~ 72–77
120.12 action] Actions 48*64 | ~ 67–68 | actions 70 | ~ 72–77
120.13 escape from a state] get out of a State of Mind 48–50 | ~ 56–77
120.14 think, that] think 48–50 | ~ 56–77
120.17 accurate] exact 48–50 | ~ 56–77
120.22 diffident] modest and reserv'd 48–56 | ~ 58–77
120.23 be] are 48–70 | ~ 72–77
120.24 might] may 48–60 | ~ 64–77
120.35 in order to] to 48–50 | ~ 56–77
121.3 to the] the 48 | ~ 50–77
121.7 that] of 48–56 | ~ 58–77
121.8 could] to 48–56 | ~ 58–77
121.9 besides] beside 48–50 | ~ 56–64 | beside 67–68 | ~ 70–77
121.13 which they] they 48–50 | ~ 56–77
121.16 determination,] Determinations 48*67 | determination 68 | determinations, 70 | ~ 72–77
121.16 which we] we 48–50 | ~ 56–77
121.20 into] of 48 | ~ 50–77
121.21 and to] and 48–58 | ~ 60–77
121.21 with] to 48–70 | ~ 72–77
121.24 objects] Object 48–50 | ~ 56–77
121.25 are] is 48–50 | ~ 56–77
121.32 our utmost] all our 48–70 | our outmost 72–77
121.34 undeterminate] undetermin'd 48–56 | ~ 58–77
121.38 of] of the Truth of 48–50 | ~ 56–77
n. 35.3 know] can know 48–50 | ~ 56–77
122.9 be, however false] be 48 | ~ 50–77
122.11 proposition, which is not true,] false Proposition 48 | Proposition, which is not true, 50*77
122.19 aught] {GG} | ought 48–77
122.20 orbits] Orbits 48*64 | orbit 67–68 | ~ 70–77
122.21 which] that 48–50 | ~ 56–77
122.23 greater] greatest 48–72 | ~ 77
122.32 partly] and partly 48–50 | ~ 56–77
123.3 to wit,] *viz*. 48–72 | ~ 77
123.6 our hand] hand 48–50 | ~ 56–77
123.7 *reasoning*] *Reasonings* 48*68 | ~ 70–77

123.8 *reasoning*] *Reasonings* 48*68 | ~ 70–77
123.9 *matter*] *Matters* 48*70 | ~ 72–77
123.9 *and*] *or* 48–68 | ~ 70–77

Hume's Index
(Editions: 58, 64, 67, 68, 70, 72, 77)

Lead Entry	
Alexander the Impostor	of] in 58	~ 64–77
Cause and Effect,	Idea] ~ 58–70	Ideas 72–77
Experience,	Source] ~ 58–67	The Source 68	~ 70–77
Homer,	Unity of his Fable] **This entry occurs 58–72 only.**
Indians	Indians] Indian 58	~ 64–77
Milton,	Milton, the Unity of his Fable] **This entry occurs 58–72 only.**
Miracles,	**A separate line has been added before 'one'.**
Unity of Action,	Unity of Action, what] **This entry occurs 58–72 only.**

BIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX

This Appendix includes biographical sketches for all individuals mentioned in the text and the notes of *EHU*. Hume refers to most by name, but occasionally uses an indirect, yet definite, reference, such as 'the poet who said', followed by a quotation.

Biographical data are not supplied in this Appendix for persons mentioned by the editor but not by Hume. Basic facts on editor-introduced persons are presented upon their first appearance in the Editor's Annotations and Introduction.[1] Titles such as 'Count' and 'Duke' have been used only if customary in a presentation of the name.

The abbreviations RL (Reference List) and Cat. (Catalogue) are placed at the end of each biographical portrait if the person's works are cited in one or both of these bibliographical appendices (found on pp. 281–306). The abbreviation 'q.v.' refers the reader to another entry in the Biographical Appendix. The form 'c.' abbreviates 'century' and 'centuries'.

ADDISON, JOSEPH (1672–1719), English essayist, poet, dramatist, and politician. Addison held several government posts and became a Member of Parliament. He contributed regularly to the *Tatler*, the *Guardian*, the *Spectator*, and other journals. His 274 issues of the *Spectator* were acclaimed for their style and humour. (RL)

ALCIBIADES of Athens (5th c. BC), politician and military commander, student of Protagoras (q.v.) and Socrates (q.v.). He held important Athenian military positions. Accused of mutilation of busts of the gods and profanation of the Eleusinian mysteries, he fled from Athens to Sparta and then Persia and became an enemy of Athens. Eventually he rejoined the Athenian army.

ALEXANDER III (known as ALEXANDER THE GREAT) (4th c. BC), Macedonian king and military leader, student of Aristotle (q.v.). His empire extended through North Africa to the Middle East and the eastern Mediterranean coasts. His rule eventuated in a Hellenization of occupied territories.

ALEXANDER OF ABONUTEICHOS (known as ALEXANDER THE PAPHLAGONIAN) (2nd c. AD), impostor and charlatan whose tricks and oracles were reported by his contemporary Lucian (q.v.).

ANNE OF AUSTRIA (*French* ANNE D'AUTRICHE) (1601–66), queen of France and daughter of Philip III of Spain. She married and then separated from Louis XIII of France. From 1643 to 1661 she was queen regent for her son Louis XIV and selected Cardinal Jules Mazarin as prime minister and principal adviser.

[1] The hundreds of sources consulted for this Appendix cannot be individually acknowledged. However, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, in both its first and second editions, was especially important for information on classical figures.

ARISTOTLE of Stageira (4th c. BC), Hellenic philosopher known for his contributions to several fields of knowledge. He was a student of Plato (q.v.) at the Academy and the teacher of Alexander the Great (Alexander III, q.v.). (RL; Cat.)

ARNAULD, ANTOINE (1612–94), French philosopher, theologian, and mathematician. He was a doctor of the Sorbonne and was ordained a Roman Catholic priest. He collaborated with Pierre Nicole (q.v.) to write *Logic or the Art of Thinking* and to investigate theological controversies. Much of his writing and publishing career was spent defending Jansenism against Jesuit criticisms. (RL)

AURELIUS, MARCUS, surnamed ANTONINUS (2nd c. AD), Roman emperor (161–80) and Stoic philosopher. His reign was consumed largely by military defence against rebellion and external attack. His Stoic philosophy is found in his *Meditations* (or *Communings with Himself*), an unarranged series of aphorisms and reflections apparently transcribed from a notebook or diary that was intended for personal recollection and guidance. (RL)

BACON, FRANCIS, Baron Verulam, Viscount St Albans (1561–1626), philosopher, essayist, barrister, and lord chancellor of England. He devised a plan of research the purpose of which was to organize the sciences on a grand scale. His *Novum organum* and *Advancement of Learning* were distinct parts of this research plan. (RL; Cat.)

BAYLE, PIERRE (1647–1706), French philosopher, encyclopaedist, and critic. His controversial *Dictionary Historical and Critical* (*Dictionnaire historique et critique*) had a deep influence on eighteenth-century thought in France and Great Britain, although he had eminent detractors. (RL)

BEDE, or BEDA (known as the VENERABLE BEDE) (7th–8th c. AD), English historian, scientist, and monk. According to his own list, he wrote thirty-eight works on diverse subjects by age 59. Bede wrote history by combining previous histories, local records, and oral reports. (RL; Cat.)

BERKELEY, GEORGE (1685–1753), Irish Episcopalian cleric and philosopher. He was influenced by Descartes (q.v.), Malebranche (q.v.), Newton (q.v.), Boyle, and Locke (q.v.), whose theories he often criticized. In his twenties he published his major philosophical works: *An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision* (1709), *A Treatise concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* (1710), and *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous* (1713). After ecclesiastical and academic appointments in Ireland and travel in Europe and America, he was appointed to the bishopric of Cloyne. (RL; Cat.)

BISHOP OF TOURNAY. See GILBERT DE CHOISEUL.

CARDINAL DE RETZ. See RETZ, JEAN FRANÇOIS PAUL DE GONDI.

CATO, MARCUS PORCIUS (known as CATO THE ELDER) (3rd–2nd c. BC), Roman military tribune and statesman. He was a successful orator whose history and speeches were well known to Cicero.

Cato, Marcus Porcius (known as Cato the Younger) (1st c. BC), Roman Stoic philosopher and tribune. He earned a reputation for conscientious fairness, moral character, and eloquence.

Choiseul, Gilbert de (1613–89), bishop of Tournay. After becoming a doctor of the Sorbonne, he was named to the bishopric of Comminges in 1664 and to the bishopric of Tournay in 1672. He engaged in negotiations to reconcile the parties in the Roman Catholic Church, then split over issues of Jansenism. These negotiations aggravated both parties, and critics accused him of siding with the Jansenists. Later he wrote *Mémoires touchant la religion*, which attacks atheists, deists, free-thinkers, and Protestants. (RL; Cat.)

Cicero, Marcus Tullius (also known as Tully) (lst c. BC), Roman orator, statesman, and author. In addition to orations and correspondence, he wrote poetry and works on rhetoric, epistemology, moral philosophy, political theory, and theology. (RL; Cat.)

Clarke, Samuel (1675–1729), English philosopher and theologian. Clarke was a fellow at Cambridge, served in several parishes as rector, and became chaplain to Queen Anne. She appointed him rector of St James, Westminster. He published sermons and treatises on metaphysics, ethics, theology, and physical theory. In a famous body of correspondence he debated Leibniz (q.v.) on questions of human freedom and physical theory. (RL; Cat.)

Copernicus, Nicolaus (1473–1543), Polish astronomer, physician, and canon. His treatise in defence of a heliocentric theory of the universe set the course for modern astronomy.

Cudworth, Ralph (1617–88), English philosopher, professor of Hebrew, and master of Christ's College at Cambridge. His two major works are *The True Intellectual System of the Universe* and *A Treatise concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality*.

Curtius Rufus, Quintus (1st c. AD), rhetorician and historian of Alexander the Great (Alexander III, q.v.). His method is dramatic narrative that does not dwell on minor details or on Alexander's place in history. (RL; Cat.)

Demetrius I (4th–3rd c. BC), king of Macedonia. He attempted to follow the policy that his father, Antigonus I, enacted to reunite the empire of Alexander the Great (Alexander III, q.v.). He gained control of the Hellenic territories and invaded Asia, but lost much of his army and surrendered to Seleucus I in 285.

Demosthenes of Athens (4th c. BC), Hellenic orator and statesman. He opposed the territorial ambitions of Philip II, as recorded in his orations known as the *Philippics*. He led a patriotic party set in opposition to the orator Aeschines, who headed the Macedonian party. Demosthenes delivered his oration *On the Crown* in response to Aeschines.

Descartes, René (1596–1650), French philosopher, scientist, and mathematician. In 1628 he went into seclusion in Holland for intensive study and development of his

ideas. There he gained an international reputation as a philosopher and mathematical physicist through correspondence, personal acquaintance with influential figures, and the circulation of his manuscripts. Publication of *Discourse on the Method* and *Meditations on First Philosophy* enhanced his reputation. (RL; Cat.)

Dio Cassius (Dio Cassius Cocceianus) (2nd–3rd c. AD), politician and historian of Rome. He was praetor and consul. His history, which focused on political events, covered the periods from Aeneas to his own time. He composed his history in eighty books, of which books 36 to 54 are preserved in full and nine other books in part. (RL; Cat.)

Duc De Châtillon. See Montmorency.

Elizabeth I (1533–1603), queen of England from 1558 to 1603, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. She succeeded her sister Mary and acknowledged James VI of Scotland as her successor on her deathbed.

Epictetus of Hierapolis (Phrygia) (1st–2nd c. AD), Stoic philosopher. A former slave, his teachings on ethics and theology attracted many pupils, among them Arrian, who recorded and preserved notes of Epictetus' lectures published as the *Discourses* and the *Manual*. (RL; Cat.)

Epicurus of Samos (4th–3rd c. BC), philosopher and founder of Epicureanism. He came to Athens and established a school intended to rival the Academy. Only fragments of his reputedly extensive writings remain. (RL)

Euclid of Alexandria (4th–3rd c. BC), leading mathematician of antiquity. His *Elements* is an axiomatic treatment of geometry that presents plane geometry, the theory of numbers, irrationals, and solid geometry. (RL)

Hérault, René (1691–1740), chief of law enforcement in Paris. He aggressively maintained public order. In collaboration with Cardinal André-Hercule de Fleury, he worked to suppress the supporters of Jansenist causes.

Herodotus of Halicarnassus (5th c. BC), historian of Persia and the Hellenic world. His history in nine books discusses the Persians and the Persian invasion of the Hellenic states. He primarily provides biographical detail and narrative reports. (RL; Cat.)

Hippocrates of Cos (5th–4th c. BC), physician and theoretician of medicine. The facts of his life are obscure, and it is not known how many, if any, of the works in the large corpus of Hippocratic treatises he wrote. (RL)

Homer (8th c. BC), poet assigned by ancient tradition as the author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, two paradigms of epic poetry. (RL; Cat.)

Jansen, Cornelius Otto (1585–1638), Flemish Roman Catholic priest, theologian, biblical scholar, and bishop of Ypres. He led a theological revival of St Augustine's views. His movement, later known as Jansenism, encountered opposition from the Jesuits. His views appeared in his *Augustinus*, a defence of St Augustine and an attack on Jesuit theologians. (RL)

La Bruyère, Jean de (1645–96), French author and translator of Theophrastus. His literary fame derives from his *Characters*. It contains epigrams, sketches of persons, and moral essays on themes of social conscience and social corruption. (RL)

Laelius, Gaius (2nd c. BC), Roman Stoic, soldier, and statesman. He was a close friend of Scipio Aemilianus (q.v.), and Cicero (q.v.) considered him to be the outstanding orator of his time.

Lefranc, or le Franc, Anne (18th c. AD), ill patient who visited Saint-Médard cemetery and within a few days was allegedly cured of apparently incurable blindness, partial paralysis, and other infirmities. Her cure was the first widely announced miracle at the tomb of Abbé Pâris (q.v.).

Leibniz, or Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm (1646–1716), German mathematician, philosopher, and diplomat in the service of the German government. He wrote numerous short treatises in mathematics, theology, jurisprudence, physics, logic and scientific method, and metaphysics and epistemology. His *Theodicy* is the only book he published in his lifetime, although he prepared a critique of Locke's (q.v.) *Essay* for publication. (RL; Cat.)

Livy (Titus Livius) (1st c. BC–1st c. AD), Paduan historian of Rome. He composed his history in 142 books, covering the period from the origins to *circa* 9 BC (the death of Drusus). Only thirty-five books and fragments are extant. His stated purpose for the work was to reveal the lessons of the past. The work was an immediate and enduring popular success. (RL)

Locke, John (1632–1704), English philosopher, physician, and political figure. After holding academic appointments, he became involved in medicine and political affairs. The earl of Shaftesbury gave him minor political appointments until the earl fell from power. After coming under political suspicion in England, he fled in 1683 to Holland, where he took refuge until 1689. His best-known works, *An Essay concerning Human Understanding* and *Two Treatises on Civil Government*, were both first published in 1690. (RL; Cat.)

Lucian of Samosata (2nd c. AD), Hellenic satirist, rhetorician, and poet. He wrote eighty pieces, primarily in dialogue style. He satirized the religious beliefs of his period as well as the pretensions of the various schools of philosophy. He also wrote biographical and rhetorical works, but his development of the satiric dialogue is commonly regarded as his major contribution. (RL; Cat.)

Lucretius (Titus Lucretius Carus) (1st c. BC), philosophical poet. Little has been confirmed about his life other than his authorship of *De rerum natura*, a didactic poem in six books that presents the physical, psychological, metaphysical, and moral theories of Epicurus (q.v.). (RL; Cat.)

Malebranche, Nicolas (1638–1715), French philosopher and theologian. At age 22 Malebranche joined a cell of the Congregation of the Oratory in Paris, a group emphasizing perfection in Christian doctrine. After training in biblical studies and in

Aristotelianism, he discovered Descartes (q.v.). Cartesian doctrines motivated *The Search after Truth*, his most influential work. (RL; Cat.)

Mariana, Juan de (1536–1624), Spanish Jesuit, historian, and political economist. His history of Spain combines legends and stories with mainstream history. He taught theology, wrote biblical commentary, and sharply criticized some fellow Jesuits. Some of his writings on political and moral subjects were banned by the Inquisition. (RL; Cat.)

Milton, John, English poet (1608–74). He abandoned a potential career as a minister in favour of poetry. In addition to *Paradise Lost*, he wrote prose works in support of the cause of liberty and liberation. (RL; Cat.)

Molina, Luis de (1535–1600), Spanish Jesuit theologian and founder of the system known as Molinism. His theological reflections on divine grace and human free will expressed controversial views that stimulated a response from the Dominicans. There ensued a protracted conflict between that order and the Jesuits.

Montgeron, Louis-Basile Carré de (1686–1754), counsellor to Parliament in Paris and defender of Jansenism. Once a professed deist, libertine, and sceptic about miracles, he reversed his views when he visited the tomb of Abbé Pâris (q.v.). He undertook *La Vérité des miracles operés par l'intercession de m. de Paris* in an attempt to document miraculous cures, and he provided funds and protection from arrest for followers of Jansenism. (RL; Cat.)

Montmorency, Paul Sigismond de (1663–1731), the duc de Châtillon. He plays a role in the miracle of a paralysed boy, Blaise Neret, as presented in the *Second Recueil des miracles operés par l'intercession de M. de Pâris*. The duke gave shelter to this boy, who went to the tomb of the Abbé Pâris and two days later was cured. The duke then allegedly became convinced of the authenticity of the miracle.

Nero (Nero Claudius Caesar Drusus Germanicus) (1st c. ad), Roman emperor. Nero installed his former teachers Seneca and Burrus as heads of government. When they retired, Nero's reign turned tyrannical. He murdered both his mother and his wife, and eventually caused Seneca's death.

Newton, Isaac (1642–1727), English mathematician, natural philosopher, and writer on biblical and theological subjects. The body of science in his *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* and *Opticks* includes rules of method, the method of fluxions, the law of the composition of light, and the laws of universal gravitation. (RL; Cat.)

Nicole, Pierre (1625–95), French Jansenist theologian and writer on moral subjects. He collaborated with Antoine Arnauld (q.v.) to write *Logic or the Art of Thinking* and to engage in numerous theological controversies. (RL)

Noailles, Louis-Antoine de (1651–1729), archbishop of Paris and cardinal. He was a prominent figure in religious controversies in France. Holder of a doctoral degree in theology from the Sorbonne, he approved some Jansenist literature and strongly opposed enthusiastic anti-Jansenists, including some figures in the French govern-

ment. He also opposed the papal bull *Unigenitus* until he retracted his opposition less than a year before his death.

Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso) (1st c. BC–1st c. AD), Roman poet. Among his chief works is *Metamorphoses*, which involves a chain of stories about change of shape and includes a rich body of mythology. An immensely popular poet in Rome, he was banished for an unknown offence against political authorities. (RL; Cat.)

Pâris, François de (known as Abbé Pâris) (1690–1727), Jansenist deacon who stood in staunch opposition to the papal bull *Unigenitus*. He lived austerely in a poor quarter of Paris, in service as a priest to the community. After his death at age 37 his followers believed that miraculous cures occurred at the site of his tomb in the cemetery of the Église Saint-Médard.

Pascal, Blaise (1623–62), French mathematician, philosopher, and theologian. While at the peak of his creative endeavours and reputation in science and mathematics, he became a devoted Jansenist. Pascal then went to Port-Royal, where he became involved in the life of the community and wrote treatises for the Jansenists. His *Provincial Letters* is composed of epistles in defence of Jansenism and in opposition to the Jesuits. His *Pensées* is composed of notes he had intended to shape into an organized work in Christian apologetics. (RL)

Paul, St (born Saul) (1st c. AD), Christian apostle to the Gentiles and martyr. His epistles to churches he visited on missionary tours form a major section of the New Testament.

Plato of Athens (5th–4th c. BC), philosopher, founder of the Academy, and teacher of Aristotle (q.v.). Teaching at the Academy and writing his dialogues occupied him for approximately the last forty years of his life. (RL; Cat.)

Plutarch of Chaeronea (1st–2nd c. AD), biographer, moral philosopher, and historical scholar. His biographies of leading figures in the Graeco-Roman world are basic sources of biographical data about the ancients. Among his philosophical writings are short essays on moral philosophy, defences of Platonism, and treatises in opposition to Stoicism and Epicureanism. A priest of Apollo at Delphi for the last thirty years of his life, he adhered to ancient religious beliefs. (RL; Cat.)

Polemo, or Polemon of Athens (4th–3rd c. BC), philosopher. He was a follower of Plato (q.v.) and succeeded Xenocrates (q.v.) as head of the Academy from 314 to 313.

Polybius of Megalopolis (2nd c. BC), historian of Rome. Deported to Rome under political suspicion, he became a friend and teacher of Scipio Aemilianus, who introduced him to Roman military activities on the front lines. Five books and fragments of his forty-book *History* have survived. In composing this history, Polybius sought not only to narrate events but to understand the causes of major political and military events in order to instruct political and military leaders. (RL)

Protagoras of Abdera in Thrace (5th c. BC), early professional Sophist. He travelled from region to region, claiming to teach politics and excellence in conduct.

Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaeus) of Alexandria (2nd c. ad), mathematician, astronomer, and geographer. His *Almagest*, which presents a geocentric astronomy, was a canonical work for over a thousand years.

Pyrrho of Elis (4th–3rd c. bc), philosopher and reputed founder of the ancient sceptical tradition. He left no writings, but later historians recorded his theories.

Racine, Jean (1639–99), French playwright. His earlier and best-known works were tragedies, whereas his later products were religious dramas. He served together with Boileau as historiographer to Louis XIV. His *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal* was published almost a half-century after his death. (RL; Cat.)

Retz, Jean François Paul de Gondi (known as Cardinal de Retz) (1614–79), political leader and archbishop of Paris. In an attempt to win political support, the queen regent had Retz appointed cardinal, but his political affiliations led to his imprisonment. He escaped from prison and travelled extensively. His life and times are reported in his *Memoirs*. (RL; Cat.)

Scipio Aemilianus Africanus Numantinus, Publius Cornelius (2nd c. bc), Roman military tribune and consul. Cicero viewed him as the ideal statesman because of his political and military successes.

Silva, or Sylva, Jean-Baptiste (1682–1742), physician, author of medical treatises, and medical consultant to the French monarch. He was solicited to investigate the allegedly miraculous cure of Marguerite Thibault (q.v.).

Socrates of Athens (5th c. bc), philosopher. Although immortalized as the primary figure in Plato's (q.v.) dialogues, Socrates produced no philosophical writings and little is known about his life until the events surrounding his death. According to Plato and Xenophon, he was indicted and sentenced to death for theological innovation and for teachings that corrupted the youth of Athens.

Speusippus of Athens (4th c. bc), philosopher. He was Plato's nephew and succeeded Plato as head of the Academy from 347 to 339. Only scattered fragments of his works remain.

Suetonius (Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus) (1st–2nd c. ad), Roman lawyer, biographer, and historian. His *Lives of the Caesars* contains portraits and entertaining anecdotal material of the first twelve caesars, including intimate details of their private lives. (RL; Cat.)

Sylva, Jean-Baptiste. See Silva.

Tacitus, Cornelius (1st–2nd c. ad), Roman orator, politician, and historian. His *Histories*, from the reign of Galba to that of Domitian, and the later *Annals*, from Tiberius (q.v.) to the death of Nero (q.v.), are histories of various rulers of the Roman empire, but major portions of these works have not survived. (RL; Cat.)

Thibault, or Thibaut, Marguerite (18th c. ad), an ill patient allegedly cured at the tomb of Abbé Pâris (q.v.). She became one of the premier cases in the Jansenist collection of documented miracles.

Tiberius (Tiberius Julius Caesar Augustus) (1st c. BC–1st c. AD), Roman emperor. He served as military commander, consul, and tribune before becoming the adopted son of Augustus. When Augustus died, Tiberius reigned from AD 14 to 37. Plagued by mental instability, he has often been depicted as cruel and abusive.

Tillotson, John (1630–94), English preacher and theologian. He was dean of Canterbury and of St Paul's, and then became archbishop of Canterbury. Although renowned as a talented preacher, his strong polemics against Roman Catholic beliefs in his sermons and writings made him a controversial figure. (RL; Cat.)

Tully. See Cicero.

Vespasian (Titus Flavius Vespasianus) (1st c. AD), Roman emperor from 69 to 79. The legions at Alexandria hailed him as imperator in mid-69, and by the end of 69 he had been appointed emperor by the Senate. He became emperor while attempting to quell the Jewish rebellion.

Vintimille Du Luc, Charles-Gaspard de (1655–1746), archbishop of Paris. He succeeded to the position upon the death of Cardinal Noailles (q.v.) in 1729. He was a friend of Noailles's opponent Cardinal André-Hercule de Fleury, who favoured 'le parti moliniste'. Vintimille investigated Jansenist claims and generally rejected them.

Voltaire (pseud. of François-Marie Arouet) (1694–1778), prominent French literary figure. His writings were laced with satire and criticism directed at political incompetence, tyranny, religious prejudice, and bigotry. Between 1716 and 1726 he was imprisoned twice. After his second liberation he retreated to England, where he composed *La Henriade*. (RL; Cat.)

Xenocrates of Chalcedon (4th c. BC), philosopher. He was a follower of Plato (q.v.) and succeeded Speusippus (q.v.) as head of the Academy from 339 to 314 BC. Some of his works reconstructed Plato's philosophy.

Zeuxis of Heraclea (5th–4th c. BC), painter in Athens and in other city-states. He worked in several media.

REFERENCE LIST

The authors and works listed in this list are of two types: (1) works cited by Hume in *EHU*, and (2) works cited by the editor in the annotations, introduction, and other parts of this volume.

Entries for Latin, French, and other foreign-language sources generally follow late twentieth-century styles for these languages. However, the early modern works were published when inconsistencies in language and publishing conventions were commonplace. These inconsistencies cause variation in accents, capitalization, and punctuation from item to item.

Loeb Library editions are used for classical works wherever possible (abbreviated 'Loeb Library'). The dates listed are printing dates for the works consulted, not original dates of publication or dates of revised editions. Printing dates vary widely in some multi-volume editions.

Works published anonymously are not presented as anonymous (or by use of brackets around the names of authors) if the author has been established.

'A Calculation of the Credibility of Human Testimony', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 21 (1699), 359–65 (pub. anonymously).

Adams, William, *An Essay in Answer to Mr. Hume's Essay on Miracles*, 2nd edn. (London, 1754) (pub. as *An Essay on Mr. Hume's Essay on Miracles*, 1752).

Addison, Joseph. See *The Spectator*.

Admonitions from the Dead, in Epistles to the Living . . . to Promote the Cause of Religion and Moral Virtue (pub. anonymously, London, 1754; 2nd edn. 1754 and 1757).

Anderson, George, *An Estimate of the Profit and Loss of Religion, Personally and Publicly Stated: Illustrated with References to Essays on Morality and Natural Religion* (Edinburgh, 1753).

Annet, Peter, *The Resurrection of Jesus Considered; In Answer to the Tryal of the Witnesses* (London, 1744).

Aquinas. See Thomas Aquinas.

Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).

—— *The Metaphysics*, trans. Hugh Tredennick, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1933–5).

—— *The Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Library (1947).

—— *Parts of Animals*, trans. A. L. Peck, Loeb Library (1945).

—— *The Physics*, trans. Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1929–34).

—— *The Poetics*, trans. W. Hamilton Fyfe, Loeb Library (1927). Bound with 'Longinus' and Demetrius. *EHU* n. 5.

—— *The Politics*, trans. B. Jowett, in vol. 2 of *The Complete Works of Aristotle*.

—— *On the Soul*, trans. J. A. Smith, in vol. 2 of *The Complete Works of Aristotle*.

ARNAULD, ANTOINE. See also Leibniz.
——*De la frequente communion* [*On Frequent Communion*], 11th edn. (Lyon, 1739).
——*On True and False Ideas: New Objections to Descartes' Meditations*, trans. Elmar J. Kremer (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990).
——and NICOLE, PIERRE, *Logic or the Art of Thinking*, ed. and trans. Jill Vance Buroker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
ARRIAN (FLAVIUS ARRIANUS). See also Epictetus.
——*Anabasis Alexandri* [*Anabasis of Alexander*], trans. P. A. Brunt, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1976–83).
AUGUSTINE, *The City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods (New York: Modern Library, 1950).
——*The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, trans. John Hammond Taylor, SJ (New York: Newman Press, 1982).
AURELIUS ANTONINUS, MARCUS, *The Communings with Himself* [*The Meditations*], trans. C. R. Haines, Loeb Library (1924).
BACON, FRANCIS, *Novum organum* [*The New Instrument*], in vols. 1 and 4 of *The Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, 14 vols. (London, 1857–74; fac. Stuttgart: Frommann, 1961–3). *EHU* n. 27.
BALFOUR, JAMES, *A Delineation of the Nature and Obligation of Morality. With Reflexions upon Mr. Hume's Book, intitled*, An Inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals (Edinburgh, 1753; fac. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1989).
——*Philosophical Essays* (Edinburgh, 1768).
BARFOOT, MICHAEL, 'Hume and the Culture of Science in the Early Eighteenth Century', in M. A. Stewart (ed.), *Studies in the Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 151–90.
BARROW, ISAAC, 'Of the Vertue and Reasonableness of Faith', Sermons 2 and 3 in *The Works of the Learned Isaac Barrow*, ed. Revd Dr Tillotson, vol. 2 (London, 1686).
BAXTER, ANDREW, *An Enquiry into the Nature of the Human Soul: Wherein the Immateriality of the Soul is Evinced from the Principles of Reason and Philosophy*, 2 vols. (London, 1737; fac. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1990).
BAYLE, PIERRE, *Continuation des* Pensées diverses écrites à un docteur de Sorbonne (Rotterdam, 1705).
——*The Dictionary Historical and Critical of M^r. Peter Bayle*, ed. and trans. Pierre Des Maizeaux, 2nd edn., 5 vols. (London, 1734–8; fac. New York: Garland, 1984).
——*Nouvelles de la republique des lettres*, in *Œuvres diverses* (The Hague, 1727; fac. Hildesheim: Olms, 1970).
BEATTIE, JAMES, *An Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth; In Opposition to Sophistry and Scepticism* (Edinburgh, 1770; fac. New York: Garland, 1983).
——*Essays*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1776).
BEDE, *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, in *Baedae: Opera historica*, trans. J. E. King, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1962).

——'The Life and Miracles of Saint Cuthbert', in *The Complete Works of Venerable Bede* (London, 1843).

Bentley, Richard, *Eight Boyle Lectures on Atheism* (London, 1692; fac. New York: Garland, 1976). Includes 'Matter and Motion cannot Think', and 'The Folly of Atheism'. (The general subject is 'A Confutation of Atheism'. The first lecture was delivered from the pulpit of St Martin's Church, 7 Mar. 1692.)

——*Remarks upon a Discourse of Free-Thinking*, in vol. 3 of *The Works of Richard Bentley*, ed. Alexander Dyce, 3 vols. (London, 1836–8).

Berkeley, George, *Alciphron*, in vol. 3 of *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*.

——*An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision*, in vol. 1 of *The Works of George Berkeley*.

——*A Treatise concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, in vol. 2 of *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*. *EHU* n. 32.

——*Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, in vol. 2 of *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*. *EHU* n. 32.

——*The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*, ed. A. A. Luce and T. E. Jessop, 9 vols. (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1948–57).

Berman, David, *A History of Atheism in Britain: From Hobbes to Russell* (London: Croom Helm, 1988).

Bernoulli, J., *Ars conjectandi* [*Art of Conjecture*] (Basle, 1713).

——'Correspondence between Leibnitz and Bernoulli', in *Translations from James Bernoulli*, trans. Bing Sung (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Department of Statistics, 12 Feb. 1966).

Bible, *The Holy Bible . . . The Authorized Version Published in the Year 1611* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

Blair, Hugh, *Lectures on Rhetoric and* Belles Lettres (London, 1833).

——*Observations Upon a Pamphlet, intitled*, An Analysis of the Moral and Religious Sentiments contained in the Writings of Sopho, and David Hume, Esq, &c. (Edinburgh, 1755).

Blount, Charles, *Anima mundi: or, An Historical Narration of the Opinions of the Ancients Concerning Man's Soul After this Life* (London, 1679).

——*Great is Diana of the Ephesians: or, The Original of Idolatry* (London, 1680).

Bonar, John, *An Analysis of the Moral and Religious Sentiments contained in the Writings of Sopho, and David Hume, Esq . . .* (Edinburgh, 1755).

Box, M. A., 'An Allusion in Hume's *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals* Identified', *Notes & Queries*, 231 (Mar. 1986), 60–1.

Boyle, Robert, *The Christian Virtuoso*, in vol. 5 of *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*.

——*A Disquisition about the Final Causes of Natural Things*, in vol. 5 of *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*.

——*An Excursion about the Relative Nature of Physical Qualities*, in vol. 3 of *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*.

Boyle, Robert, *Experiments and Considerations Touching Colours*, ed. Marie Boas Hall (London, 1664; fac. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1964).

——*New Experiments Physico-Mechanical, touching the Spring of the Air*, in vol. 1 of *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*.

——'Of Men's Great Ignorance of the Uses of Natural Things', in vol. 3 of *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*.

——*The Origine of Forms and Qualities* or *The Origin of Forms and Qualities According to the Corpuscular Philosophy*, in vol. 5 of *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*.

——*The Sceptical Chymist*, in vol. 1 of *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*.

——*Some Considerations about the Reconcileableness of Reason and Religion*, in vol. 4 of *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*.

——*The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle*, ed. Thomas Birch, 6 vols. (London, 1772; fac. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966). (Birch died six years before this edition appeared; it was based on Birch's 1744 edition.)

Bracken, Harry M., 'On Some Points in Bayle, Berkeley, and Hume', *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 4 (1987), 435–46.

Bramhall, John, *A Defence of True Liberty* (London, 1655; fac. New York: Garland, 1977).

Breitinger, Heinrich, *Les Unités d'Aristote avant le Cid de Corneille* [*The Unities of Aristotle before Corneille's Le Cid*] (Geneva, 1879).

Briggs, John, *The Nature of Religious Zeal, in Two Discourses . . .* (London, 1775).

Browne, Peter, *The Procedure, Extent, and Limits of Human Understanding* (London, 1728).

Browne, Thomas, *Pseudodoxia epidemica*, in vol. 2 of *The Works of Sir Thomas Browne*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

Burke, Edmund, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, ed. J. T. Boulton (London: Routledge, 1958).

Burton, J. H. (ed.), *Letters of Eminent Persons Addressed to David Hume* (Edinburgh, 1849; fac. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1989).

——, *Life and Correspondence of David Hume*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1846; fac. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967; New York: Garland, 1983).

Butcher, S. H., 'The Dramatic Unities', in *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, 4th edn. (New York: Dover, 1951).

Butler, Joseph, *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, in vol. 1 of *The Works of Joseph Butler*.

——*Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel*, in vol. 2 of *The Works of Joseph Butler* (under the title *Fifteen Sermons*).

——*The Works of Joseph Butler*, ed. W. E. Gladstone, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896).

Calvin, Jean, *Traitté des reliques* [*Treatise on Relics*] (Geneva, 1599).

Campbell, Archibald, *The Necessity of Revelation: Or An Enquiry into the Extent of Human Powers with Respect to Matters of Religion* (London, 1739).

Campbell, George, *A Dissertation on Miracles: Containing An Examination of the Principles advanced by David Hume, Esq; In an Essay on Miracles* (Edinburgh, 1762; 3rd edn. Edinburgh, 1796 and 1797).

——*Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence* (London, 1807).

——*The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 2 vols. (London, 1776).

Cardano, Gerolamo, *Liber de ludo aleae* [*The Book on Games of Chance*], in Oystein Ore, *Cardano: The Gambling Scholar* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953).

Casaubon, Méric, *A Treatise Concerning Enthusiasme*, ed. Paul J. Korshin (London, 1656; fac. Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1970).

Challe, Robert, *Difficultés sur la religion proposées au père Malebranche* [*Difficulties about Religion Proposed to Father Malebranche*], ed. Frédéric Deloffre and Melâhat Menemencioglu (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1982). (Challe's authorship has been disputed; see Deloffre, *Autour de Robert Challe*, 247–79.)

Chambers, Ephraim, *Cyclopœdia: or, An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, 5th edn., 2 vols. (London, 1741–3).

Charleton, Walter, *Physiologia Epicuro–Gassendo–Charltoniana: or a Fabrick of Science Natural, Upon the Hypothesis of Atoms* (London, 1654; fac. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1966).

Charleton, William, 'Dialogue the Second', in *The Immortality of the Soul Demonstrated by the Light of Nature* (London, 1699).

Cheyne, George, *An Essay on Regimen. Together with Five Discourses, Medical, Moral, and Philosophical: Serving to Illustrate the Principles and Theory of Philosophical Medicin, and Point Out some of its Moral Consequences* (London, 1740).

——*The English Malady* (London, 1733; fac. Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1976).

——*Philosophical Principles of Natural Religion: Containing the Elements of Natural Philosophy and the Proofs for Natural Religion Arising from Them* (London, 1705). (A second part was added in 1715; both parts were published in various editions prior to the publication of *EHU*.)

Chillingworth, William, *The Religion of Protestants*, in *The Works of W. Chillingworth* (London, 1836).

Choiseul du Plessis-Praslin, Gilbert de, *Mémoires touchant la religion* [*Memoirs concerning Religion*], 2 vols. (Paris, 1685).

Chuo University Publications, *David Hume and the Eighteenth Century British Thought: An Annotated Catalogue*, ed. Sadao Ikeda, 2 vols. (Tokyo: Chuo University Library, 1986–8).

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *Academica* [*The Academy*], in *De natura deorum, Academica*.

——*De finibus bonorum et malorum* [*On the Chief Good and Evil*], trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Library (1921). *EHU* n. 9.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *De natura deorum* [*On the Nature of the Gods*], in *De natura deorum, Academica*.

——*De natura deorum, Academica*, trans. H. Rackham, Loeb Library (1972).

Clair, Colin, *A History of Printing in Britain* (London: Cassell, 1965).

Clarke, Samuel, *A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion*, in vol. 2 of *The Works of Samuel Clarke*.

——*Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God*, in vol. 2 of *The Works of Samuel Clarke*.

——*The Leibniz–Clarke Correspondence*, ed. H. G. Alexander (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970).

——*Sermons on Several Subjects*, in vols. 1 and 2 of *The Works of Samuel Clarke*.

——*The Works of Samuel Clarke, D.D.*, 4 vols. (London, 1738; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

Clauberg, Johann, *Opera omnia philosophica* (Amsterdam, 1691).

Cochrane, J. A., *Dr. Johnson's Printer: The Life of William Strahan* (London: Routledge, 1964).

Collier, Arthur, *Clavis Universalis*, ed. Ethel Bowman (Chicago: Open Court, 1909).

Collins, Anthony, *A Discourse of Free-Thinking* (London, 1713; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

——*A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* (London, 1724; fac. New York: Garland, 1976).

——*A Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty* (London, 1717; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

Colver, A. Wayne, 'A Variant of Hume's Advertisement Repudiating the *Treatise*', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 67 (1973), 66–8.

——'The "First" Edition of Hume's Essays and Treatises', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 68 (1974), 39–44.

Condillac, Étienne Bonnot de, *An Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge* (London, 1756; fac. Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1971).

Cordemoy, Gerauld [Géraud] de, *Six discours sur la distinction et l'union du corps et de l'ame* [*Six Discourses on the Distinction and the Union of the Body and the Mind*—the later title of *Le discernement de l'âme et du corps* (1666)], in *Œuvres philosophiques*, ed. Pierre Clair and François Girbal (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968).

Coryate, Thomas, *Coryats Crudities* (London, 1611; fac. London: Scolar Press, 1978).

Craig, John, *Theologiæ Christianæ Principia Mathematica* (London, 1699).

Curteis, Thomas, *A Dissertation on the Unreasonableness, Folly and Danger of Infidelity* (London, 1725).

Curtius Rufus, Quintus, *History of Alexander*, trans. John C. Rolfe, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1946). *EHU* Sect. 8.8.

Daston, Lorraine, *Classical Probability in the Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

David, F. N., *Games, Gods and Gambling* (New York: Hafner, 1962).

Deloffre, Frédéric (ed.), *Autour de Robert Challe* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1993).

'Democritus', *Weekly Magazine, or Edinburgh Amusement*, 13 (1771), 195–8.

de Moivre, Abraham, *The Doctrine of Chances, or, A Method of Calculating the Probabilities of Events in Play* (London, 1756; fac. New York: Chelsea, 1967).

Dennis, John, *The Critical Works of John Dennis*, ed. Edward Niles Hooker, 2 vols. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1939–43).

Descartes, René, *Discourse on the Method*, in vol. 1 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

——'Letter to Mersenne', 16 Oct. 1639, in vol. 3 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

——'Letter to Princess Elizabeth', 6 Oct. 1645, in vol. 3 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

——'Letter to Vorstius', 19 June 1643, in vol. 3 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

——*Meditations on First Philosophy*, in vol. 2 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

——*Objections and Replies*, in vol. 2 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

——*The Passions of the Soul*, in vol. 1 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

——*The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, ed. and trans. John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, and Dugald Murdoch, 3 vols.; vol. 3 also trans. Anthony Kenny (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984–91).

——*Principles of Philosophy*, in vol. 1 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

——*Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, in vol. 1 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes.*

——*Treatise on Man*, in vol. 1 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes.*

Des Voeux, Antoine Vinchon, *Critique générale du livre de mr. de Montgeron, sur les miracles de mr. l'Abbé de Paris* [*General Criticism of Mr. de Montgeron's book on the Miracles of Mr. l'Abbé de Paris*], 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1740).

Diderot, Denis, *Pensées philosophiques* [*Philosophical Thoughts*], ed. Robert Niklaus (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1965).

——and Jean Le Rond D'Alembert (eds.), *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* [*Encyclopaedia or Analytical Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts, and Occupations*], 5 vols. (Paris, 1751–80; fac. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon, 1969).

Digby, Kenelme, *Two Treatises, in the one of which, The Nature of Bodies, in the other, The Nature of Mans Soul is Looked into in Way of Discovery of the Immortality of Reasonable Souls* (London, 1644).

Dio Cassius Cocceianus, *Dio's Roman History*, trans. Ernest Cary, 9 vols., Loeb Library (1914–27). *EHU* n. 30.

Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, in vol. 5, trans. C. H. Oldfather, of *Diodorus of Sicily*, 12 vols., Loeb Library (1933–67).

Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. R. D. Hicks, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1925–70).

Dodwell, Henry, *Christianity not Founded on Argument; and the True Principle of Gospel-Evidence Assigned* (London, 1741).

Douglas, John, *The Criterion: or, Miracles Examined with a View to Expose the Pretensions of Pagans and Papists* (London, 1754).

Dryden, John, 'A Character of Polybius and his Writings', ed. A. E. Wallace Maurer, in vol. 20 of *The Works of John Dryden*.

——*An Essay of Dramatick Poesie and Shorter Works*, ed. Samuel Holt Monk, in vol. 17 of *The Works of John Dryden*.

——*The Works of John Dryden*, 20 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956–).

Ellys, Anthony, *Remarks on an Essay concerning Miracles, Published by David Hume, Esq.; amongst his* Philosophical Essays (n.d.; London, 1752), in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*.

Epictetus, *The Discourses*, in *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments*.

——*The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments*, trans. W. A. Oldfather, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1926–8).

——*The Fragments*, in *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian*, *The Manual*, *and Fragments*.

Epicurus, *The Epicurus Reader*, ed. and trans. Brad Inwood and L. P. Gerson (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994).

Euclid, *The Thirteen Books of Euclid's Elements*, ed. and trans. Thomas L. Heath, 3 vols. (New York: Dover, 1956).

'Eumenes', *Weekly Magazine, or Edinburgh Amusement*, 13 (1771), 97–102, 265–9, 358–60.

Fermat. See Pascal.

Fontenelle, Bernard le Bovier de, *The History of Oracles and the Cheats of the Pagan Priests*, in *The Achievement of Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle*, ed. Leonard M. Marsak (London, 1688; fac. New York: Johnson, 1970).

Foucher, Simon, *Critique of the* Search for the Truth, in *Malebranche's First and Last Critics*, ed. and trans. Richard A. Watson and Marjorie Grene (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1995).

Fréret, Nicolas, *Examen critique des apologistes de la religion chrétienne* [*Critical Examination of the Apologists of the Christian Religion*], in *Œuvres complettes de M. Freret*, 4 vols. in 1 (London, 1775; fac. Westmead: Gregg International, 1972).

Galilei, Galileo, *The Assayer*, in *The Controversy on the Comets of 1618*, trans. Stillman Drake and C. D. O'Malley (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960).

—— *Two New Sciences: Including Centers of Gravity & Force of Percussion*, trans. Stillman Drake (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974).

Gaskell, Philip, 'The Strahan Papers', *Times Literary Supplement* (5 Oct. 1956), 592–3.

Gassendi, Pierre, *Exercises against the Aristotelians*, in *The Selected Works of Pierre Gassendi*.

—— *Institutio logica*, trans. Howard Jones (Lugduni, 1658; fac. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1981).

—— 'Letter to Diodati', in *The Selected Works of Pierre Gassendi*.

—— *The Rebuttals Against Descartes*, in *The Selected Works of Pierre Gassendi*.

—— *The Selected Works of Pierre Gassendi*, ed. and trans. Craig B. Brush (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1972).

—— *The Syntagma*, in *The Selected Works of Pierre Gassendi*.

Gawlick, Günter, and Kreimendahl, Lothar, *Hume in der deutschen Aufklärung. Umrisse einer Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Frommann, 1987).

Gay, John, *Preliminary Dissertation Concerning the Fundamental Principle of Virtue or Morality* (London, 1731; fac. New York: Garland, 1978). (This work is 'prefix'd' to William King's *Essay on the Origin of Evil* in the 1731 edition.)

Gee, Edward, *The Texts Examined which Papists cite . . . concerning the Worship of Images and Relics* (London, 1738).

Gerard, Alexander, *An Essay on Taste*, together with *Observations concerning The Imitative Nature of Poetry*, 3rd edn. (Edinburgh, 1780; fac. Gainesville, Fla.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1963).

Geulincx, Arnold, *Opera Philosophica*, 3 vols., ed. J. P. N. Land (The Hague, 1891–3; fac. Stuttgart: Frommann, 1968).

Gilbert, William, *On the Loadstone and Magnetic Bodies*, trans. P. Fleury Mottelay, in vol. 28 of *Great Books of the Western World*, 2nd edn. (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1990).

Gilson, Étienne, *Index Scolastico-Cartésien* [*Scholastic–Cartesian Index*] (Paris: Librairie Philosophique, 1979).

Glanvill, Joseph, *Essays on Several Important Subjects in Philosophy and Religion* (London, 1676; fac. Stuttgart: Frommann, 1970).

—— *Scepsis scientifica: or Confest Ignorance, the Way to Science* (London, 1665; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

—— Sermon 3: 'Moral Evidence of a Life to Come', in *Seasonable Reflections and Discourses* (London, 1676).

Goodich, Michael E., *Violence and Miracle in the Fourteenth Century: Private Grief and Public Salvation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

Gravesande, W. James s', *Mathematical Elements of Natural Philosophy*, trans. J. T. Desaguliers, 2 vols. (London, 1747). (Includes 'An Oration concerning Evidence'.)

Grose, Thomas Hodge, 'History of the Editions', in vol. 3 of *The Philosophical Works of David Hume*, ed. T. H. Green and T. H. Grose, 4 vols. (London, 1875;

fac. Aalen: Scientia, 1964). (This 'History' is not reprinted in all of the facsimile editions listed below under 'Hume'.)

Grotius, Hugo, *The Truth of the Christian Religion*, trans. John Clarke (London, 1827).

Guthrie, W. K. C., *The Sophists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).

Hacking, Ian, *The Emergence of Probability* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).

Hald, Anders, *A History of Probability and Statistics and their Applications before 1750* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1990).

Halyburton, Thomas, *Natural Religion Insufficient, and Revealed Necessary, to Man's Happiness in his Present State . . .* (Philadelphia, 1798; first pub. Edinburgh, 1714).

Handover, P. M., *Printing in London: From 1476 to Modern Times* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960).

Harvey, William, *An Anatomical Disquisition on the Motion of the Heart and Blood in Animals*, in vol. 26 of *Great Books of the Western World*, 2nd edn. (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1990).

Henderson, Robert, 'A Short Account of the University of Edinburgh, the present Professors in it, and the several Parts of Learning taught by Them', *Scots Magazine*, 3 (1741), 371–4.

Herbert of Cherbury, Edward Herbert, Lord, *De veritate*, trans. Meyrick H. Carré (Bristol: University of Bristol, 1937).

Hernlund, Patricia, 'William Strahan's Ledgers: Standard Charges for Printing, 1738–1785', *Studies in Bibliography*, 20 (1967), 89–111.

——'William Strahan's Ledgers II: Standard Charges for Papers, 1738–1785', *Studies in Bibliography*, 22 (1969), 179–95.

Herodotus, *History*, trans. A. D. Godley, 4 vols., Loeb Library (1921–4). *EHU* Sect. 10.28.

Hesiod, *Works and Days*, in *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica*, trans. Hugh G. Evelyn-White, Loeb Library (1936).

Hillyard, Brian, 'The Keepership of David Hume', in P. Cadell and A. Matheson (eds.), *For the Advancement of Learning: Scotland's National Library 1689–1989* (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1989).

——and Norton, David Fate, 'The Hume Bookplate: A Cautionary Note', *Book Collector*, 40 (1991), 539–45.

Hippocrates, *Nature of Man*, in *Hippocrates*, trans. W. H. S. Jones, Loeb Library (1931). Bound with Heracleitus, *On the Universe*.

Hoadly, Benjamin, *Queries Recommended to the Authors of the late* Discourse of Free-Thinking (London, 1713).

Hobbes, Thomas, *An Answer to a Book published by Dr. Bramhall . . . called the* Catching of the Leviathan, in vol. 4 of *The English Works*.

—— *The Answer of Mr. Hobbes to Sir William Davenant's Preface before* Gondibert, in vol. 4 of *The English Works*.

——*Elements of Philosophy . . . concerning Body*, in vol. 1 of *The English Works*.
——*The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. William Molesworth, 12 vols. (London, 1839–45; fac. London: Routledge/Thoemmes, 1994, as *The Collected Works of Thomas Hobbes*).
——*Human Nature, or the Fundamental Elements of Policy*, in vol. 4 of *The English Works*.
——*Leviathan*, ed. Edwin Curley (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994).
——*Of Liberty and Necessity*, in vol. 4 of *The English Works*.
——*The Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance . . . between . . . Bramhall . . . and . . . Hobbes*, in vol. 5 of *The English Works*.
——*Seven Philosophical Problems*, in vol. 7 of *The English Works*.
Holcomb, Kathleen, 'Reid in the Philosophical Society', in M. Dalgarno and E. Matthews (eds.), *The Philosophy of Thomas Reid* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989).
Homer, *The Iliad*, trans. A. T. Murray, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1976–8). *EHU* Sect. 3.11.
——*The Odyssey*, trans. A. T. Murray, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1966). *EHU* Sect. 3.12.
Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus), *Ars poetica* [*The Art of Poetry*], in *Satires, Epistles and Ars poetica*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough, Loeb Library (1947).
Huet, Peter, *A Philosophical Treatise concerning the Weakness of Human Understanding* (London, 1725).
Hume, David, *A Dissertation on the Passions*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).
——*A Letter from a Gentleman to his Friend in Edinburgh*, ed. Ernest C. Mossner and John V. Price (Edinburgh, 1745; fac. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1967). (Pub. anonymously; though now commonly ascribed to Hume, it was heavily edited by Henry Home, Lord Kames, and may be more Kames's product than Hume's.)
——*An Abstract of a Book lately Published; Entituled, A Treatise of Human Nature, &c.*, in *A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton.
——*An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
——*A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
——*Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*, ed. Eugene F. Miller, 2nd edn. (Indianapolis: LibertyClassics, 1987).
——*The History of England: From the Invasion of Julius Caesar to The Revolution in 1688*, 6 vols. (Indianapolis: LibertyClassics, 1983–5).
——'Hume's Early Memoranda, 1729–1740', ed. Ernest C. Mossner, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 9 (1948), 492–518.
——*The Letters of David Hume*, ed. J. Y. T. Greig, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932).
——*Letters of David Hume to William Strahan*, ed. Birkbeck Hill (Oxford, 1888).

HUME, DAVID, *The Natural History of Religion and Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*, ed. A. Wayne Colver and John Valdimir Price (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

——*New Letters of David Hume*, ed. Raymond Klibansky and Ernest C. Mossner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954).

——*The Philosophical Works of David Hume*, ed. T. H. Green and T. H. Grose, 4 vols. (London, 1854, 1875, 1882; fac. Aalen: Scientia, 1964).

HUTCHESON, FRANCIS, *Collected Works of Francis Hutcheson*, 7 vols., fac. edn. by Bernhard Fabian (Hildesheim: Olms, 1969–71).

——*An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections. With Illustrations On the Moral Sense* (London, 1728), in vol. 2 of *Collected Works of Francis Hutcheson*.

——*An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* (London, 1725), in vol. 1 of *Collected Works of Francis Hutcheson*.

JACKSON, JOHN, *An Address to Deists* (London, 1744).

JANSEN, CORNELIUS (CORNELIUS JANSENIUS), *Augustinus*, 3 vols. in 1 (Rouen, 1652).

JESSOP, T. E., *A Bibliography of David Hume and of Scottish Philosophy from Francis Hutcheson to Lord Balfour* (London: Brown, 1938; repr. 1983).

JOHNSON, SAMUEL, *Johnson's Dictionary*, ed. E. L. McAdam, Jr., and George Milne (New York: Pantheon, 1963).

—— *The Rambler*, ed. W. J. Bate and Albrecht B. Strauss, in vol. 3 (1969) of *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, 16 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958—).

KAMES, LORD (HENRY HOME), *Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion* (Edinburgh, 1751; fac. New York: Garland, 1976).

——'Of the Laws of Motion' ('Article 1'), in *Essays and Observations, Physical and Literary. Read before a Society in Edinburgh, and published by them* (Edinburgh, 1754).

KEILL, JAMES, *Essays on Several Parts of the Animal Oeconomy*, 4th edn. (London, 1738).

KEILL, JOHN, *An Examination of Dr. Burnet's Theory of the Earth*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1734).

——*An Introduction to the True Astronomy; or, Astronomical Lectures Read in the Astronomical School of the University of Oxford*, 3rd edn. (London, 1739).

KERNAN, ALVIN, *Printing Technology, Letters, & Samuel Johnson* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

KING, WILLIAM, *An Essay on the Origin of Evil* (London, 1731; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

KREISER, B. ROBERT, *Miracles, Convulsions, and Ecclesiastical Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).

Kuehn, Manfred, 'Hume in the *Göttingische Anzeigen*', *Hume Studies*, 13 (1987), 46–73.

La Bruyère, Jean de, *Characters*, trans. Henri Van Laun (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963).

La Forge, Louis de, *Traitté de l'esprit de l'homme* [*Treatise of the Spirit of Man*] (Amsterdam, 1666; fac. Hildesheim: Olms, 1984).

Laird, John, *Hume's Philosophy of Human Nature* (London: Methuen, 1932; fac. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1967; New York: Garland, 1983).

La Mettrie, Julien Offrey de, *Machine Man*, in *Machine Man and Other Writings*, ed. and trans. Ann Thomson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

La Mothe Le Vayer, François de, *De la vertu des payens*, in vol. 1 of *Œuvres*, 6 vols. (Dresden, 1767; fac. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970).

Law, Edmund, *An Enquiry into the Ideas of Space, Time, Immensity, and Eternity* (London, 1734; fac. New York: Garland, 1976).

Lee, Henry, *Anti-Scepticism: Or, Notes upon Each Chapter of Mr. Lock's* Essay concerning Humane Understanding (London, 1702; fac. Hildesheim: Olms, 1973).

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, *A New System of the Nature and Communication of Substances, and of the Union of the Soul and Body*, in *Philosophical Essays*.

——*Discourse on Metaphysics*, in *Philosophical Essays*.

——*The Leibniz–Arnauld Correspondence*, ed. and trans. H. T. Mason (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1967).

——*New Essays Concerning Human Understanding*, trans. Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

——*Philosophical Essays*, ed. and trans. Roger Ariew and Daniel Garber (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1989).

——*Primary Truths*, in *Philosophical Essays*.

——*Principles of Nature and Grace, Based on Reason*, in *Philosophical Essays*.

——*The Principles of Philosophy, or, the Monadology*, in *Philosophical Essays*.

——*Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origin of Evil*, ed. Austin Farrer, trans. E. M. Huggard, from C. J. Gerhardt's edn. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952).

——See Bernoulli; Clarke.

Leland, John, *A View of the Principal Deistical Writers of the Last and Present Century*, 3rd edn., 2 vols. (London, 1757); and vol. 3, Supplement (London, 1756); fac. of all 3 vols. (New York: Garland, 1978).

Lipsius, Justus, *Two Books Of Constancie*, ed. Rudolf Kirk, trans. John Stradling (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1939).

Livy (Titus Livius), *From the Founding of the City* [*History*], trans. B. O. Foster, 14 vols., Loeb Library (1919–59).

Locke, John, *A Discourse of Miracles*, in vol. 9 of *The Works of John Locke*.

——*An Essay concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Peter H. Nidditch (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975). *EHU* nn. 1, 10, 12.

Locke, John, *A Third Letter for Toleration: to the Author of the Third Letter concerning Toleration*, in vol. 6 of *The Works of John Locke*.

—— *The Works of John Locke*, 10th edn., 10 vols. (London, 1801).

Longinus. See *On the Sublime*.

Lucan (Marcus Lucanus), *The Civil War* (*Pharsalia*), trans. J. D. Duff, Loeb Library (1928).

Lucian, *Alexander, or the False Prophet*, trans. A. M. Harmon, Loeb Library (1925). *EHU* Sect. 10.22–3.

—— *The Carousal, or the Lapiths* [*The Drinking Party, or Lapithae*], trans. A. M. Harmon, Loeb Library (1921). *EHU* n. 28.

—— *The Eunuch*, trans. A. M. Harmon, Loeb Library (1936). *EHU* nn. 29–30.

—— *Zeus Rants*, trans. A. M. Harmon, Loeb Library (1929).

Lucretius Carus, Titus, *De rerum natura* [*On the Nature of the Universe*], trans. W. H. D. Rouse, rev. Martin Ferguson Smith, Loeb Library (1975). *EHU* n. 26.

Lyttelton, George, *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul, in a Letter to Gilbert West, Esq.* (1747), in *The Works of George Lord Lyttelton*, 3rd edn., 3 vols. (London, 1776).

Maclaurin, Colin, *An Account of Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophical Discoveries* (London, 1748; fac. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968).

McLeod, Randall, 'Collator in a Handbag' (Toronto: Graduate Department of English, University of Toronto, 1986).

Malebranche, Nicolas, *Dialogues on Metaphysics*, trans. Willis Doney (New York: Abaris Books, 1980).

—— *The Search after Truth*, ed. and trans. Thomas M. Lennon and Paul J. Olscamp (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1980). (Includes *Elucidations of* The Search after Truth.)

—— *Treatise on Nature and Grace*, ed. and trans. Patrick Riley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

Mandeville, Bernard de, *The Fable of the Bees: OR, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, ed. F. B. Kaye, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924; repr. Indianapolis: LibertyClassics, 1988).

Manning, Owen, *An Inquiry into the Grounds and Nature of the Several Species of Ratiocination. In which, The Argument made Use of in the Philosophical essays of D. Hume, Esq; is occasionally taken Notice of* (London, n.d. (*c*.1750); fac. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1989).

Mariana, Juan de, *The General History of Spain*, trans. John Stevens (London, 1699).

Mersenne, Marin, *La Vérité des sciences. Contre les sceptiques ou Pyrrhoniens* [*The Truth of the Sciences. Against the Sceptics or Pyrrhonians*] (Paris, 1625; fac. Stuttgart: Frommann, 1969).

—— *Questions inouyes* [*Unheard-of Questions*] (Paris: Fayard, 1985).

—— 'Second Set of Objections' (compiled by Mersenne), in Descartes, *Objections and Replies*, in vol. 2 of *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*.

MIDDLETON, CONYERS, *A Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers* (London, 1749; fac. New York: Garland, 1976).

——*An Introductory Discourse to a Larger Work . . . concerning the Miraculous Powers* (London, 1747).

MILTON, JOHN, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York: Macmillan, 1985). *EHU* Sect. 3.17.

MONTAIGNE, MICHEL EYQUEM DE, *Essays*, in *The Complete Essays*, ed. and trans. M. A. Screech (London: Penguin Books, 1993).

MONTESQUIEU, CHARLES LOUIS DE SECONDAT, BARON DE, 'Essai sur le goût' ['Essay on Taste'], in Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*.

MONTGERON, LOUIS BASILE CARRÉ DE, *La Verité des miracles operés par l'intercession de m. de Paris* [*The Truth of the Miracles Brought about by the Intercession of M. de Pâris*] (Utrecht, 1737; Cologne, 1739). *EHU* n. 25.

MONTMORT, RÉMOND DE, *Essay d'analyse sur les jeux de hazard* [*Analytical Essay on Games of Chance*], 2nd edn. (Paris, 1713).

MORE, HENRY, *A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings of Dr. Henry More*, 2 vols. (London, 1662; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

——*An Antidote against Atheism*, in vol. 1 of *A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings of Dr. Henry More*.

——*Enthusiasmus Triumphatus*, in vol. 1 of *A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings of Dr. Henry More*.

—— *The Immortality of the Soul*, in vol. 2 of *A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings of Dr. Henry More*.

MORERI, LEWIS, *The Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical and Poetical Dictionary*, 2nd edn., 2 vols. (London, 1701).

MOSSNER, ERNEST CAMPBELL, 'Hume's Early Memoranda, 1729–1740', ed. Ernest C. Mossner, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 9 (1948), 492–518.

—— *The Life of David Hume*, 2nd edn. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980).

MUMBY, FRANK ARTHUR, and NORRIE, IAN, *Publishing and Bookselling* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1944).

NEWTON, ISAAC, *Opticks* (London, 1730; fac. New York: Dover, 1952).

——*Philosophiæ naturalis principia mathematica* [*Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*], in *Sir Isaac Newton's Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy and his System of the World*, trans. Andrew Motte, rev. Florian Cajori (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1946). *EHU* n. 16.

NORTON, DAVID FATE, and NORTON, MARY J., *The David Hume Library* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, 1996).

NOXON, JAMES, *Hume's Philosophical Development: A Study of his Methods* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973).

On the Sublime, incorrectly attributed to Longinus, trans. W. Hamilton Fyfe, Loeb Library (1927). Bound with Aristotle and Demetrius.

ORIGEN, *Contra Celsum* [*Against Celsus*], trans. Henry Chadwick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

'Orthodoxus', *Weekly Magazine, or Edinburgh Amusement*, 13 (1771), 51–2.

Oswald, James, *An Appeal to Common Sense in Behalf of Religion*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1766–72).

Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso), *Metamorphoses*, trans. Frank Justus Miller, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1960–4). *EHU* Sect. 3.7.

Pardies, Ignace-Gaston, *Discours de la connoissance des bestes* [*Discourse on the Understanding of Animals*], ed. Leonora Cohen Rosenfield (Paris, 1672; fac. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1972).

Pascal, Blaise, *Pensées and Other Writings*, trans. Honor Levi (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). (*Pensées* was first published in 1670 by Arnauld, Nicole, and others.)

—— *The Provincial Letters*, trans. A. J. Krailsheimer (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967).

—— and Pierre de Fermat, 'Letters between Fermat and Pascal and Carcavi', in F. N. David, *Games, Gods, and Gambling* (New York: Hafner, 1962).

Périer, Gilberte, *The Life of Mr. Pascal, written by Mrs. Périer, his Sister*, in Pascal, *Pensées*, trans. Martin Turnell (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962).

Plato, *The Apology*, in *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*.

—— *Cratylus*, in *Cratylus, Parmenides, Greater Hippias, Lesser Hippias*, trans. Harold North Fowler, Loeb Library (1926).

—— *Crito*, in *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*.

—— *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*, trans. Harold North Fowler, Loeb Library (1923).

—— *Phaedo*, in *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*.

—— *Theaetetus*, in *Theaetetus, Sophist*, trans. Harold North Fowler, Loeb Library (1921).

Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus), *Natural History*, in vol. 2 (1938), trans. H. Rackham, of 10 vols., Loeb Library (1938–63).

Plomer, H. R., Bushnell, G. H., and Dix, E. R. McC., for the Bibliographical Society, *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726 to 1775* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932).

Plutarch, 'Beasts are Rational', in vol. 12 (1957), trans. Harold Cherniss and William C. Helmbold, of *Moralia*.

—— *Lives*, trans. Bernadotte Perrin, 11 vols., Loeb Library (1914–28). *EHU* n. 21.

—— *Moralia* [*Moral Essays*], 16 vols., Loeb Library (1927–69).

—— 'The Oracles at Delphi', in vol. 5 (1936), trans. Frank Cole Babbitt, of *Moralia*.

—— 'Whether Land or Sea Animals are Cleverer', in vol. 12 (1957), trans. Harold Cherniss and William C. Helmbold, of *Moralia*.

Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. W. R. Paton, 6 vols., Loeb Library (1922–7). *EHU* Sect. 8.7.

Pope, Alexander, *An Essay on Criticism* (London, 1711; fac. London: Scolar Press, 1970).

—— *An Essay on Man*, ed. Maynard Mack (London: Methuen, 1951).

——'Preface' (to the *Iliad*) and 'A General View of the Epic Poem and of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Extracted from *Bossu*', in vols. 7–10 of the *Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*, ed. John Butt (London: Methuen; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954–69).

Popkin, Richard, 'So Hume did Read Berkeley', *Journal of Philosophy*, 61 (1964), 773–8.

Porphyry, *On Abstinence from Animal Food*, ed. Esme Wynne-Tyson, trans. Thomas Taylor (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1965).

Price, Richard, *A Review of the Principal Questions in Morals* (the 3rd edn. of 1787), ed. D. Daiches Raphael (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).

—— *Four Dissertations*, 2nd edn. (London, 1768; fac. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1990).

Prideaux, Humphrey, *The True Nature of Imposture fully Display'd in the Life of Mahomet*, 8th edn. (London, 1723).

Priestley, Joseph, *An Examination of Dr. Reid's* Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common Sense, *Dr. Beattie's* Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth, *and Dr. Oswald's* Appeal to Common Sense in Behalf of Religion (London, 1774; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

—— *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion*, 2nd edn., 2 vols. (Birmingham, 1782).

—— *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*, in vol. 4 of *The Theological and Miscellaneous Works, &c. of Joseph Priestley*, ed. John Towill Rutt, 25 vols. (London, 1817–32; fac. New York: Garland, 1983).

Pufendorf, Samuel, *De jure naturae et gentium* [*On the Law of Nature and Nations*], ed. and trans. C. H. Oldfather and W. A. Oldfather, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), vol. 1, fac. of 1688 edn.; vol. 2, translation.

Racine, Jean, *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal* [*Brief History of Port-Royal*], 2nd edn., ed. A. Gazier (Paris: Société Française, 1909). *EHU* n. 25.

Racine, Louis, *Mémoires contenant quelques particularités sur la vie et les ouvrages de Jean Racine* [*Memoirs Containing some Particularities of the Life and Works of Jean Racine*], in vol. 5 of *Œuvres complètes*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1808; fac. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1969).

Ramsay, Andrew Michael, *The Travels of Cyrus*, 2 vols. (London, 1730).

Ray, John, *The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of the Creation* (London, 1691).

Recueil des miracles operés au tombeau de M. de Paris Diacre [*Collection of the Miracles Performed at the Tomb of the Deacon, Monsieur de Pâris*]; pub. with: *Second recueil des miracles operés par l'intercession de M. de Paris* [*Second Collection of the Miracles Performed by the Intercession of M. de Pâris*]; *Réflexions sur les miracles operés au tombeau de M. de Paris* [*Reflections on the Miracles Performed at the Tomb of the Deacon, Monsieur de Pâris*]; *Acte passé pardevant notaires, contenant plusieurs pièces au sujet du miracle operé en la personne de mademoiselle Hardouin* [*Act Passed in front of Notaries, containing Several Documents Pertaining to the Miracle Performed upon Mademoiselle Hardouin*] (n.p., 1732) (pub. anonymously). *EHU* n. 25.

Regnard, Jean-François, *Journey to Lapland*, in vol. 1 of *A General Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels in all Parts of the World*, trans. John Pinkerton, 6 vols. (Philadelphia, 1810–12).

Reid, Thomas, *An Inquiry into the Human Mind, on the Principles of Common Sense*, in *Philosophical Works*.

——*Essays on the Active Powers of the Human Mind*, in *Philosophical Works*.

——*Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, in *Philosophical Works*.

——*Philosophical Works*, ed. Sir William Hamilton, 8th edn., 2 vols. in 1 (Edinburgh, 1895; fac. Hildesheim: Olms, 1983).

Retz, Jean François Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de, *Mémoires*, in *Œuvres*, ed. Marie-Thérèse Hipp and Michel Pernot (Paris: Gallimard, 1984). *EHU* Sect. 10.26.

——*Memoirs*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1817).

Rohault, Jacques, *A System of Natural Philosophy*, trans. John and Samuel Clarke, 2 vols. (London, 1723; fac. New York: Johnson, 1969).

Ross, Ian S., 'Hutcheson on Hume's *Treatise*: An Unnoticed Letter', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 4 (1966), 69–72.

Rutherforth, Thomas, *The Credibility of Miracles Defended against the Author of Philosophical Essays* (Cambridge, 1751), in Tweyman (ed.), *Hume on Miracles*.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, *Epistles*, in *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*, trans. Richard M. Gummere, 3 vols., Loeb Library (1917–25).

——*Moral Essays*, trans. John W. Basore, 3 vols., Loeb Library (1928–62).

Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Physicists*, trans. R. G. Bury, Loeb Library (1936).

——*Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, trans. R. G. Bury, Loeb Library (1939).

Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, third earl of, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, ed. John M. Robertson, 2 vols. in 1 (London, 1900; repr. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964).

Shapiro, Barbara, *Probability and Certainty in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study of the Relationships between Natural Science, Religion, History, Law, and Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

Sherlock, Thomas, *The Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus*, 12th edn. (Boston, 1809).

Skelton, Philip, *Ophiomaches: or, Deism Revealed*, 2 vols. (London, 1749; fac. Bristol: Thoemmes, 1990). (Entitled *Deism Revealed*, 2nd edn., 2 vols., 1751.)

Smith, Adam, *The Correspondence of Adam Smith*, ed. E. C. Mossner and I. S. Ross (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).

Somerville, James, *The Enigmatic Parting Shot: What was Hume's 'Compleat Answer to Dr Reid and to That Bigotted Silly Fellow, Beattie'?* (Aldershot: Avebury; Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate, 1995).

Somerville, Thomas, *My Own Life and Times: 1741–1814* (Edinburgh, 1861).

Sorabji, Richard, *Animal Minds and Human Morals: The Origins of the Western Debate* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993).

The Spectator, by Richard Steele, Joseph Addison, *et al.*, ed. Donald F. Bond, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

Spink, John S., *French Free-Thought from Gassendi to Voltaire* (London: Athlone, 1960; repr. 1969).

Spinoza, Baruch de, *Ethics*, in *The Collected Works of Spinoza*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. Edwin Curley (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

—— *Theologico-Political Treatise*, in vol. 1 of *The Chief Works of Benedict de Spinoza*, trans. R. H. M. Elwes (New York: Dover, 1951).

Stewart, John, 'Some Remarks on the Laws of Motion, and the Inertia of Matter' ('Article 2'), in *Essays and Observations Physical and Literary. Read before a Society in Edinburgh, and published by them* (Edinburgh, 1754).

Stewart, M. A., 'Hume's Historical View of Miracles', in M. A. Stewart and John P. Wright (eds.), *Hume and Hume's Connexions* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995).

—— *The Kirk and the Infidel: An Inaugural Lecture* (Lancaster: Lancaster University, 1994).

Stillingfleet, Edward, *Origines sacræ, or A Rational Account of the Grounds of Christian Faith, as to the Truth and Divine Authority of the Scriptures*, 2nd edn. (London, 1663).

Strahan Ledgers, London: British Library, Department of Manuscripts. William Strahan, Printer. Receipts and Payments Accounts. Nos. 48800 (1739–68; credits and payments to 1773), 48801 (1768–85), 48815 (later entries).

Suetonius Tranquillus, Gaius, *The Lives of the Caesars*, trans. J. C. Rolfe, 2 vols., Loeb Library (1979). *EHU* n. 24.

Swift, Jonathan, *A Discourse Concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit, in a Letter to a Friend. A Fragment*, in *A Tale of a Tub with Other Early Works: 1696–1707*, ed. Herbert Davis, vol. 1 of *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965–71).

—— *Mr. C——ns's Discourse of Free-Thinking, Put into plain English* (London, 1713).

Tacitus, Cornelius, *The Annals*, trans. John Jackson, in *The Annals Books I–III*, Loeb Library (1979).

—— *The Histories*, trans. Clifford H. Moore, in 2 vols., in *The Histories Books I–III*, Loeb Library (1980); and *The Histories Books IV–V, The Annals Books I–III*, Loeb Library (1979). *EHU* Sect. 8.7; note 24.

Tartaglia, Niccolò, *General trattato di numeri et misure* [*General Treatise on Number and Measure*] (Vinegia, 1556–60).

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles*, trans. Vernon J. Bourke (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975).

——*Summa theologiae*, 60 vols. (Blackfriars, in conjunction with: New York: McGraw-Hill, and London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1964–).

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, trans. Charles Forster Smith, 4 vols., Loeb Library (1920–53).

Tillotson, John, *The Works of the Most Reverend Doctor John Tillotson*, 9th edn. (Dublin, 1726). *EHU* Sect. 10.1.

Tindal, Matthew, *Christianity as Old as the Creation* (London, 1730; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

Todd, W. B., 'David Hume, A Preliminary Bibliography', in *Hume and the Enlightenment: Essays Presented to Ernest Campbell Mossner*, ed. W. B. Todd (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1974).

Toland, John, *Christianity Not Mysterious* (London, 1696; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

Topsel, Edward, *The History of Four-footed Beasts and Serpents* (London, 1658).

Trapp, Joseph, *The Nature, Folly, Sin, and Danger of Being Righteous Over-much; With a particular View to the Doctrines and Practices of certain Modern Enthusiasts*, 3rd edn. (London, 1739).

Tucker, Abraham, *The Light of Nature Pursued*, 2nd edn., 7 vols. (London, 1805; fac. New York: Garland, 1977).

Turnbull, George, *The Principles of Moral Philosophy*, 2 vols. (London, 1740; fac. Hildesheim: Olms, 1976).

Tweyman, Stanley (ed.), *Hume on Miracles* (Bristol: Thoemmes, 1996).

Two Letters to David Hume, by One of the People called Quakers: Containing a few Cursory Remarks on his Philosophical Essays (London, 1764) (pub. anonymously).

Ulman, H. Lewis (ed.), *The Minutes of the Aberdeen Philosophical Society 1758–1773* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1990).

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro), *The Aeneid*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough, 2 vols., in *Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid I–VI*, Loeb Library (1974), and *The Aeneid VII–XII, The Minor Poems*, Loeb Library (1930). *EHU* Sect. 3.12.

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, 'Goût' ['Taste'], in Diderot and D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*.

——*La Henriade*, in vol. 21 of *The Works of Voltaire: A Contemporary Version*, trans. William F. Fleming, 22 vols. (New York: St Hubert Guild, 1901). *EHU* Sect. 3.11.

Wallace, Robert, 'Observations on the Account of the Miracles of the Abbé Paris', Laing MSS, Box II. 620, item 20 (Edinburgh, n.d.). (This MS is said to have been written shortly after Wallace saw Montgeron's book. There is a dated late addition: 14 Sept. 1764.)

Warburton, William, *A Selection from Unpublished Papers of the Right Reverend William Warburton*, ed. Revd Francis Kilvert, in vol. 14. of *The Works of the Right Reverend William Warburton* (London, 1841).

——*Letters from a Late Eminent Prelate to One of his Friends* (New York, 1809; first pub. Kidderminster, 1808). (Letters from Warburton to Richard Hurd, edited by the latter.)

——*The Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion*, 2 vols. (London, 1753–4).

——*Remarks on Mr. David Hume's Essay on the Natural History of Religion: Addressed to the Rev. Dr. Warburton* (London, 1757). (Pub. anonymously and attributed by contemporaries to Richard Hurd.)

Watts, Isaac, *Logick: or, The Right Use of Reason* (London, 1726; fac. New York: Garland, 1984).

—— *The Works*, 6 vols. (London, 1810).

Webster, John, *Academiarum examen* (London, 1654; fac. in Allen G. Debus, *Science and Education in the Seventeenth Century: The Webster–Ward Debate*, London: MacDonald; New York: American Elsevier, 1970).

Whiston, William, *Reflexions on an Anonymous Pamphlet, entituled*, A Discourse of Free Thinking (London, 1713).

The Whole Duty of Man (pub. anonymously, authorship now generally attributed to Richard Allestree; first pub. as *The Practice of Christian Graces, or, the Whole Duty of Man* . . . , 1658; many subsequent editions).

Wilkins, John, *Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion* (London, 1675).

—— and Seth Ward, *Vindiciæ Academiarum* (Oxford, 1654; fac. in Allen G. Debus, *Science and Education in the Seventeenth Century: The Webster–Ward Debate*, London: MacDonald; New York: American Elsevier, 1970).

Willis, Thomas, *Cerebri anatome* [*The Anatomy of the Brain and Nerves*], ed. William Feindel, in *The Remaining Medical Works of That Famous and Renowned Physician Dr. Thomas Willis*, trans. Samuel Pordage (London, 1681; fac. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1965).

—— *Two Discourses concerning the Soul of Brutes*, trans. Samuel Pordage (London, 1683).

Wollaston, William, *The Religion of Nature Delineated* (London, 1724; fac. New York: Garland, 1978).

Wolseley, Charles, *The Reasonableness of Scripture-Belief* (London, 1672; fac. Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1973).

Wood, Paul B., *The Aberdeen Enlightenment: The Arts Curriculum in the Eighteenth Century* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1993).

—— 'David Hume on Thomas Reid's *An Inquiry into the Human Mind, On the Principles of Common Sense*: A New Letter to Hugh Blair from July 1762', *Mind*, 95 (1986), 411–16.

Woolston, Thomas, *Six Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour* (London, 1727–30; fac. New York: Garland, 1979).

Wootton, David, 'Hume's "Of Miracles": Probability and Irreligion', in M. A. Stewart (ed.), *Studies in the Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

Xenophon, *Hellenica, Books I-V*, trans. Carleton L. Brownson, vol. 1 of *Xenophon*, 4 vols., Loeb Library (1918–25).

—— *Memorabilia*, in *Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*, trans. E. C. Marchant, Loeb Library (1923).

CATALOGUE OF HUME'S REFERENCES

This Catalogue is a short-title index of Hume's references (in the text and notes) to authors and works, annotated as necessary. Every written work and associated author mentioned by Hume, explicitly or obliquely, is listed here. Hume's references are reported by section and paragraph numbers of *EHU*.

Citations by the editor in the Introduction and Annotations are normally to the Reference List, which contains a few editions listed in the Catalogue. All titles in the Catalogue also appear in the Reference List, where nineteenth- or twentieth-century editions are standard. Occasionally an item in the Catalogue is cited in the Annotations, but the function of the Catalogue is primarily to serve as a register of Hume's references. All works in the Catalogue were published prior to the first edition of *EHU*.

The editor has attempted to locate the specific editions that Hume owned or consulted. The following symbols are used:

- ° This symbol (on ten titles) signifies the existence of evidence that the listed edition was owned by Hume. The edition either appears in the Hume Library[1] or bears an authentic David Hume bookplate.[2]
- + This symbol (on two titles) signifies that either a specific edition or type of edition of a work has been cited or quoted by Hume. These editions have been identified by Hume's mention of a specific author or by the fact that only one edition was, or was likely to have been, available to him.
- ◆ This symbol (on one title) signifies that a chronologically suitable edition of a classical work verifies that Hume's reference to parts, sections, and the like of a title rely on superannuated numbering divisions and is therefore an obsolete rather than a mistaken reference.[3]

Many entries are not accompanied by one of these symbols. The particular edition of a work cited in notes or quoted by Hume often cannot be determined with precision even when an author is directly quoted by him.[4] In these cases, only titles

[1] 'Hume Library' signifies the library of Hume's nephew David (Baron) Hume (1757–1838). This library contained some books previously owned by Hume, possibly the bulk of his library. See David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, *The David Hume Library*.

[2] The presence of a David Hume bookplate is not itself sufficient to establish that the volume belonged to Hume. Baron Hume evidently used the bookplate after Hume's death, and there were two states of the bookplate, one a copy of the other. See Brian Hillyard and David Fate Norton, 'The Hume Bookplate: A Cautionary Note'. Bookplates also have been known to be fraudulently attached by modern speculators.

[3] These control editions are listed only if Hume has cited a work whose parts, sections, line numbers, and the like have not been continued in modern editions. When Hume's numbering divisions match modern systems, no specific edition is listed in the Catalogue.

[4] If no specific edition is traceable to Hume, the editor has not cited an edition that was available

and basic bibliographical information about publication dates and editions are provided.

Titles in original languages and translations into English are provided for classical and non-classical works. Greek titles are followed by a transliteration, a Latin version, and an English translation. An attempt has been made to supply more accurate translations than those found on the title pages of many published sources in English. The reader therefore should not expect the translation to follow conventional English renderings. Edition titles for collections and more inclusive works—such as *Quae exstant opera*—are not translated. Hume himself did not cite the titles of collected works, though he used such works.

Spelling, punctuation, and accents in this Catalogue sometimes vary from forms that are now customary. This Catalogue remains faithful to the prevailing forms in the eighteenth century, or earlier, as appropriate.[5]

The names of translators and editors of texts have been supplied wherever possible. Their names are reported as displayed on the title pages, except that Latin syntax has been altered as necessary. As a result of this rule, the Catalogue contains some inconsistency in the presentation of names and titles. The names of cities, as printed on title pages, have occasionally been translated into modern forms.

In almost all cases the date of first publication and information about lifetime and posthumous editions are supplied. Occasionally conclusive evidence could not be obtained regarding the date of first publication of essays or short works that were later published as parts of books. The first documented date of publication is provided in these cases.

ARISTOTLE. *Περὶ ποιητικῆς (Peri Poiētikēs) / De poetica / The Art of Poetry*. n. 5.

BACON, FRANCIS. *Novum organum / The New Instrument* (first pub. 1620), pub. as the second part of a projected six-part *Instauratio magna* [*The Great Instauration*]; other posthumous edns. n. 27.

° *Operum moralium et civilium tomus*, ed. Guilielmus Rawley (London, 1638).

BEDE. *Opera historica / Historical Works*. Sect. 10.28.

BERKELEY, GEORGE. *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* (first pub. 1710); other lifetime and posthumous edns.; rev. edn. of 1734 incorporates a new edn. of *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous* (first pub. 1713); other lifetime and posthumous edns. n. 32.

+ *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge. Wherein the Chief Causes of Error and Difficulty in the Sciences, with the Grounds of Scepticism,*

for Hume to use even if it seems plausible that he might have used that edition. Also, Hume generally does not specify whether he used an existing English translation in the case of foreign-language works that had been translated.

[5] The fact that two or more inconsistent forms appeared during the century has on several occasions forced a judgement about which form to use. In this Catalogue French accents have not been modernized, but if the preferred 17th- or 18th-century form could not be determined, an appropriate rule consistent with modern usage has been followed.

Atheism, and Irreligion, are inquired into . . . To which are added Three Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous, in Opposition to Scepticks and Atheists. London, 1734. (The first edn. of *Principles* (Dublin, 1710) had Part I incorporated as part of the original title.)

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De finibus bonorum et malorum* / *On the Supreme Good and Evil*. n. 9.

° *Opera*, ed. Pierre Joseph Olivet, 9 vols. (Paris, 1740–2).

Curtius Rufus, Quintus. *Historiae Alexandri Magni* / *The Histories of Alexander the Great*. Sect. 8.8.

° *Quintus Curtius*, ed. Usher Gahagan, 2 vols. (London, 1746).

Descartes, René.

Discours de la methode pour bien conduire sa raison, & chercher la verité dans les sciences / *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One's Reason and Seeking the Truth in the Sciences* (first pub. 1637), anon.; other posthumous edns. Sect. 12.3.

Meditationes de prima philosophia / *Meditations on First Philosophy* (first pub. 1641); other lifetime and posthumous edns. Sect. 12.3.

Dio Cassius Cocceianus. *Ῥωμαϊκαὶ Ἱστορίαι (Rōmaika historiai)* / *Romanae historiae* / *Roman Histories*. n. 30.

Epictetus. *Ἐγχειρίδιον (Encheiridion)* / *Enchiridion* / *Manual*. Sect. 5.1.

° *Omnia Graece et Latine: Epicteti Enchiridion, Cebetis Tabula, Prodici Hercules, et Cleanthis Hymnus* (Glasgow, 1744).

Herodotus. *Ἱστορίαι (Historiai)* / *Historiae* / *Histories*. Sect. 10.28.

Homer.

Ἰλιάς (Ilias) / *Ilias* / *Iliad*. Sect. 3.11.

Ὀδύσσεια (Odusseia) / *Odyssea* / *Odyssey*. Sect. 3.12.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Essais de theodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme, et l'origine du mal* / *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origin of Evil* (first pub. 1710); other lifetime and posthumous edns. Sect. 5.20.

° *Essais de théodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme, et l'origine du mal*, 2 vols. in 1 (Amsterdam, 1720).

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding* (first pub. 1690); other lifetime and posthumous edns. nn. 1, 10, 12, 16.

Lucian.

Ἀλεξάνδρος ἢ ψευδόμαντις (Alexandros ē pseudomantis) / *Alexander seu Pseudomantis* / *Alexander, or the False Prophet*. Sect. 10.22.

Συμπόσιον ἢ Λαπίθαι (Sumposion ē Lapithai) / *Convivium seu Lapithae* / *The Drinking Party, or Lapithae*. n. 28.

Εὔνουχος (Eunouchos) / *Eunuchus* / *The Eunuch*. nn. 29–30.

Lucretius Carus, Titus. *De rerum natura* / *On the Nature of the Universe*. n. 26.

° ◆ *De rerum natura*, ed. Sigebertus Havercampus, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1725).

Malebranche, Nicolas. *De la recherche de la verité / The Search after Truth* (first pub. 1674–5); other lifetime and posthumous edns. n. 16.

° *De la recherche de la verité*, 3rd edn., 3 vols. (Lyon, 1684).

Mariana, Juan de. *Historiae de rebus Hispaniae / General History of Spain* (first pub. in Latin 1592, in Spanish 1601, in English 1699, posthumously); other lifetime and posthumous edns. Sect. 10.28. (The English title above is the conventional English title, not a direct translation of the Latin.)

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost* (first pub. 1667); other lifetime and posthumous edns. Sect. 3.17.

Montgeron, Louis Basile Carré de. *La Verité des miracles operés par l'intercession de m. de Paris / The Truth of the Miracles Brought about by the Intercession of M. de Pâris* (first pub. 1737); other lifetime edns. n. 25.

Newton, Isaac. *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica / Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* (first pub. 1687); other lifetime and posthumous edns. Sect. 1.15.

Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso). *Metamorphoses / Metamorphoses*.

° *Opera quae extant*, 5 vols. (London, 1745). Sect. 3.7.

Plutarch. *Βίοι (Bioi) / Vitae / Lives*. Sects. 3.14, 10.28; n. 21.

Racine, Jean. *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal / Brief History of Port-Royal* (first pub. 1742 in part, 1747 in whole, both posthumous); other posthumous edns. n. 25.

Recueil des miracles operés au tombeau de M. de Paris Diacre / Collection of the Miracles Performed at the Tomb of the Deacon, Monsieur de Pâris (first pub. 1732); another incomplete edn. 1733–6.

+ *Recueil des miracles operés au tombeau de M. de Paris Diacre / Collection of the Miracles Performed at the Tomb of the Deacon, Monsieur de Pâris*; pub. with: *Second recueil des miracles operés par l'intercession de M. de Paris / Second Collection of the Miracles Performed by the Intercession of Monsieur de Pâris*; *Reflexions sur les miracles operés au tombeau de M. de Paris Diacre / Reflections on the Miracles Performed at the Tomb of the Deacon, Monsieur de Pâris*; *Acte passé pardevant notaires, contenant plusieurs pièces au sujet du miracle operé en la personne de mademoiselle Hardouin / Act Passed in front of Notaries, containing Several Documents Pertaining to the Miracle Performed upon Mademoiselle Hardouin* (n.p., 1732).

Retz, Jean François Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de. *Mémoires / Memoirs* (first pub. 1717, posthumously); other posthumous edns. Sect. 10.26.

° *Mémoires*, ed. Jean Fréderic Bernard, 4 vols., rev. edn. (Amsterdam, 1731).

Suetonius Tranquillus, Gaius. *Vita Caesarum / Life of the Caesars*. n. 24.

Tacitus, Publius Cornelius. *Historiae / Histories*. n. 24.

Tillotson, John.

A Discourse against Transubstantiation (first pub. 1684), later Sermon 26 of *Fifty-four Sermons and Discourses* (first pub. in *Works*, 1696); other lifetime and posthumous edns. Sect. 10.1.

'The Hazard of being Saved in the Church of Rome', Sermon 11 of *Fifty-four Sermons and Discourses* (first pub. in *Works*, 1696); other lifetime and posthumous edns. Sect. 10.1.

Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro). *Aeneis* / *Aeneid*. Sect. 3.12.

° *Opera* (London, 1744). (Hume may have owned more than one relevant edition of Virgil. See Norton and Norton, *The David Hume Library*.)

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de. *La Henriade* / *The Henriade* (first pub. under this title 1728, 1723 edn. under the title *La Ligue, ou Henry le Grand*); other lifetime and posthumous edns. Sect. 3.11.

HUME'S INDEX

This Index is Hume's,[1] except for the substitution of sections, paragraphs, and note numbers for his pages and note markers. The Index is based on the full index for *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects*—here reduced in size to include all and only *EHU* entries. The remaining entries in the full Index are published in other volumes of the Clarendon Hume.

This Index follows the copytext's convention of capitalizing each first entry under a letter. Inconsistent capitalization of first words in the entries (using small capitals in some instances and lower case in parallel instances) has also been corrected and standardized throughout the Index. Hume's spellings are retained in all entries.

Hume's Index was published in the editions of 1758, 1764, 1767, 1768, 1770, 1772, and 1777. Variants are reported in the Editorial Appendix: Emendations and Substantive Variants.

A

ABSTRACTION, what, n. 34.
ALEXANDER the Impostor of Lucian, his Artifice, 10.22–3.
Animals, their Reason, 9.1, *&c.*
ARISTOTLE quoted, 3.10, n. 5.
Atheism, whether possible, 12.1.

B

BACON quoted, 10.39.
Belief, what, 5.10–11, *&c.*
BERKELEY, Dr., a real Sceptic, n. 32.

C

CARTES, DES, quoted, n. 16.
Cause and Effect, its Idea, whence, 4.4–6, *&c.* Its Definition, 7.29, n. 17.
Causation, a Reason of Association, 3.2, 5.18, *&c.*
Chance, what, 6.1.
Christian Religion founded in Faith, not in Reason, 10.40.

[1] For evidence of Hume's active involvement in creating the original Index of 1758, see correspondence of 18 Jan. 1757, to Andrew Millar; 15 Feb. 1757, to William Strahan; 3 Sept. 1757 (*Letters*, 1: 239, 245, 265).

Cicero quoted, n. 9.
Conjunction, frequent, constant, the only circumstance from which we know Cause and Effect, 7.21, 7.26, 8.5, 8.7, &c.
Connexion, necessary, our Idea of it, 7.1 ff., &c.
Contiguity, a Reason of Association, 3.2, 5.14.
Custom or Habit the Source of experimental Reasoning, 5.5.
——, the great Guide of Life, 5.6.

E

Elizabeth, Queen, whether her Resurrection could be proved, 10.37.
Energy, its Idea, 7.3, 7.7.
Epicurus, his Apology, 11.9 ff., 27, &c.
Evidence, natural and moral, of the same Kind, 8.19.
Experience, Source of all our Reasoning with regard to Fact, 4.6–7, &c.
——, why we reason from Experience, 4.14, 4.16, 8.16.
——, often the same with what we call Reason, n. 8.

F

Fact, Matters of, one Object of Reason, 4.1–2.

H

Homer, Unity of his Fable, 3.16.

I & J

Jansenists, their Genius, n. 25.
Ice, Reports of it not credible to an Indian, 10.10, n. 22.
Ideas, their Association, 3.1–2, &c., 5.12.
——, their Origin, 2.1, &c.
Immortality of the Soul, on what founded, 11.21.
Impressions, what, 2.3.
Indians justly incredulous with regard to Ice, 10.10, n. 22.

L

Liberty and Necessity, a Dispute of Words, 8.2.
Locke, Mr. quoted, n. 1, n. 10, n. 12, n. 16.
Lucian quoted, 10.22, n. 28, n. 29, n. 30.
Lucretius quoted, 10.30, n. 26.

M

Malebranche quoted, n. 16.
Mathematics, their Foundation, n. 34, their Advantages, 7.1.
Metaphysics, what, 1.7–8.
Milton, the Unity of his Fable, 3.17.
Miracles, on what their Evidence is founded, 10.1, *&c.*
——, defined, 10.12.
——, one mentioned by de Retz, 10.26.
Molinists, their Genius, n. 25.

N

Necessity, its Definition, 8.3–5, 8.27.
Nisus, or strong Endeavour, not the Origin of the Idea of Power, n. 13.

P

Paris, L'Abbé de, his Miracles, 10.27, n. 25.
Pascal quoted, n. 25.
Philosophy, the two Kinds of it, the obvious and abstruse, 1.1–3.
Power, what its Idea, 7.5–6, n. 17.
Probability, what, 6.2, 10.4.
Proof, what, n. 10, 10.4.
Providence, particular, on what founded, 11.21.

R

Racine quoted, n. 25.
Relations of Ideas, one Object of Reason, 4.1.
Resemblance, a Source of Association, 3.2, 5.14.
Retz, Cardinal de, quoted, 10.26.

S

Scepticism, 4.1 ff., 5.1 ff., excessive, 12.21, *&c.* moderate, 12.4, with regard to the Senses, 12.6, with regard to Reason, 12.17.
Sciences, their Division, 12.27.
Stoics, their idea of Providence, 8.34.
Suetonius quoted, n. 24.

T

Tacitus, 10.24–5, n. 24.
Tillotson, his Argument against the real Presence, 10.1.

U

UNITY of Action, what, 3.10.

V

VESPASIAN, his Miracle, 10.25.
Vis inertiae, n. 16.
VOLTAIRE quoted, 3.11.

W

WONDER, the Passion of, inclines us to believe Miracles, 10.16.

EDITOR'S INDEX

This index contains entries from the several parts of this volume, but names, titles, and concepts in Hume's *Advertisement* and *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (pp. 1–123) are given priority. Entries for titles of books and other publications are restricted to titles mentioned or alluded to by Hume (see the Catalogue, pp. 302–6), Hume's own works, and publications that reviewed *EHU* during Hume's lifetime. Entries for persons are not similarly restricted. *Not indexed* are the following: variants and errors listed in the Editor's Appendix (register of variants); the Glossary; the Reference List; publishers of books (other than Hume's) and cities of their publication; and bibliographical and technical data that are located in a concise section of the Introduction.

a priori reasoning 25–8, 31, 54, 61, 85–6, 122, 199
a priori theory xxxiii, lxxxi, 37, 199; *see also* experimentation
Abercairny Collection lxxvi
Aberdeen philosophy lxxxix, xciii, xcvi, xcviii–ci, 126–7
Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal (Racine) 181–3, 279
An Abstract of . . . A Treatise of Human Nature (Hume):
  annotations referring to 126, 129–30, 133, 135, 138–41, 144–6, 151, 153, 160–1, 163, 171, 194, 197–9
  origin and nature of xv–xvi, xxiv, xxix, xxxii, xxxiv–v, xliv, lxi, lxiii, lxxiv
abstract (general) ideas 116, 118, 195–8
abstract reasoning:
  a priori 31
  common life prevails over 36, 116
  difficulty of comprehending 61
  and mixed mathematics 28
  philosophical forms of xxiii, 5–9, 12, 16, 22, 121–3, 128
  regarding space, time, and quantity 116–18, 121, 123
  uncertainty in 7, 9–10, 12, 39, 59, 77–8, 107, 112; *see also* abstruse philosophy; reasoning
abstraction xv, xxvii, 12, 115–18, 167, 197, 307
abstruse philosophy xxiii, 6–12, 127–8, 131, 309; *see also* abstract reasoning; reasoning
absurdities 12, 15, 73, 89–90, 94, 116–18
academic scepticism xxv, xxxiv–v, 35, 95, 112–20, 129, 145
accidental variants xli–ii, 206–8, 217–18, 226–7
accidents 6, 27, 44, 87, 108, 147
Achilles 19, 22, 136
Adam (and Eve) 21, 25, 138, 140, 145
Adams, William lxxxvi–vii
Addison, Joseph xxiii, 6, 127, 129, 132, 138, 152, 192, 199, 272
Admonitions from the Dead (anonymous) lxxxviii–ix
Advertisement (Hume's) xiv–xv, xxxiv, xciv, xcix, cvi, 1, 125–6, 229
Æneid (Virgil) 21, 136–7

affections:
  excited by literature and eloquence 5, 20–1, 23, 35, 89
  gratification of 18
  and moral sentiment 75
  natural 133
  reflection on 13
  see also passions; eloquence
agitations of the passions 6, 13, 20, 49
alchimy 98
Alcibiades 22, 137, 272
Alembert, Jean Le Rond d' 127, 150
Alexander III (the Great) 65, 92, 161, 177, 272–4
Alexander, or the False Prophet (Lucian) 90–1, 175, 272, 307
Alexander the false prophet (of Abonuteichos) 90–1, 175, 216, 272, 307
algebra 24, 138
amazement (from scepticism) 116–17, 119
ambiguity of terms 16, 49–50, 62
ambition 37, 64, 137, 274
amiable virtue cii, 5, 7; *see also* virtue
amusement xl, lxxxi, 119, 208
analogies:
  between animals and humans xxx, 79–81, 166–8
  in causal reasoning and inference 26–7, 57, 79–80, 86, 111
  their inadequacy for knowing God lxxvii, 57, 108–9, 191
  in operations of the mind 39–41, 44
  see also reasoning
anatomy:
  anatomists 8, 129, 131, 162
  animal and human 53, 79, 153–4, 166
  and painting 8, 129; *see also* painters
  of reasoning 25
ancients 24, 139
animal nisus 54; *see also* nisus
animal oeconomy 67, 162; *see also* oeconomy
animal spirits 53, 153–4
animals:
  analogies between humans and xxx, 61, 79–81, 165–8
  generation of 55
  imaginary 40
  instinct in 80–2, 168–9
  see also animal oeconomy; animal nisus
Anne of Austria 183, 272
Annet, Peter 171–3, 281
Antigonus 177, 274
antiquity 92, 101; *see also* ancients
apologists ci, 176
apostles 83, 170, 181
Appeal to Common Sense (Oswald) ci–iii
approbation 6, 11, 75, 77
Aquinas; *see* Thomas Aquinas
Arabs (Arabians) 92; *see also* Islam; Mahomet
Arcesilas 145
archetype 115, 195
argument from design; *see* design, the argument from
Aristotelian philosophy 128, 135, 142–4, 154, 167–8, 193–4, 195–6
Aristotle:
  on animals xxx, 166
  on elements and causes 64, 147, 161, 189
  fame of 6, 128
  on unity of action and poetry 19, 136, 138, 307; *see also* unity of action
Arnauld, Antoine xxvii, xxix, xxxi–ii, 95, 129, 131–3, 138–9, 141–2, 144, 147–8, 150–1, 170, 173, 178, 181, 194, 197–200, 273
Arrian 177, 213, 275
arrogance 33, 35, 83
artifice 1, 21, 97, 107, 307
artificers 66, 68, 190
artist(s) 8, 66, 103
Asclepias 175

association of ideas:
Berkeley on xxviii, 134, 140, 155
contiguity and xxvii, 17, 19, 23, 41–4, 308
definition of 'association' 17–18, 134
mechanistic character of xxvii, 45, 81, 134, 169
Reid on xciv
resemblance and xxvii, 17–18, 22–3, 32, 41–3, 63, 135, 309
see also inference; principles
astronomers 11
astronomy 119, 122, 129–30, 189
atheism:
attributed to Hobbes 187, 192
Berkeley on 196
Epicureans as symbol of 187
and free-thinkers 182, 196, 202
imputed to Tacitus 92
miracles as refuting 95
and scepticism 112, 116
speculative 112, 192–3
Spinoza's alleged xxxiii, 192
as a threat to religion and morality 112, 164, 188
Tillotson on 169, 193
whether possible 112, 192, 307
see also free-thinkers; impiety; irreligion; libertine thought
Athens:
the Academy in 147, 278–9
Alcibiades in 137, 272
Demosthenes in 89, 274
Epicurus in 100–1, 187, 275
oratory in 89, 101 ff.; *see also* eloquence; orators
and the Peloponnesian War 137
Protagoras' banishment from 100, 186–7
siege of 22, 136–7
Socrates in 187, 279
voting in 101, 188
atoms and atomism:
atomism 189, 195
atoms 102, 147, 188–90, 195, 197
attraction (magnetic and gravitational) 26, 58, 158–9
Augustine, St 146, 173, 185, 275
Augustinian teachings 177
Aurelius, Marcus 91, 165, 175, 187, 273
austerity 95, 177, 182
avarice 64

Bacon, Francis:
and the decay of Aristotle's influence 128
and the experimental method xxiv, xxvi, 98, 130, 157, 307
and the limits of the understanding 129
his *Novum organum* xxiv, cvii, 128–9, 133, 144, 185, 273
Balfour, James xl, xcvii–viii
Balguy, John 192
Barfoot, Michael xxvi, 282
Baron Hume; *see* Hume, Baron David
Barrow, Isaac 200
Baxter, Andrew 149, 157, 196, 198, 282
Bayle, Pierre:
and free-thinking 182
on infinite divisibility xxxiv, 197
on primary and secondary qualities 195–6
on reason of animals xxx, 166–9
on reason and faith 185–6, 200
and scepticism xxv, xxxiv–v, cii, 116, 129, 157, 193, 195–6, 198
on Spinoza xxxiii–iv, 173, 192
on Zeuxis 190
Beattie, James lxxxix, xciii–iv, xcvii–ciii, 126, 171, 193
beauty 5, 8, 11, 77, 102, 123, 188
Bede, the Venerable xxxii, 95, 184, 273, 303
belief:
annexed to sentiments xxviii, 39–41, 46–7, 61, 139
and custom and tradition 38, 101

belief: (*cont.*)
in external objects lxxvi–vii, lxxxiii, xciv–v, 14–15, 29, 38–9, 41–4, 113–15, 117–18
involuntariness of 146
and memory 24–5, 36, 38–9, 44
nature of, as a distinctive feeling 40–5, 146, 307
proportioning, to the evidence 83–6, 90, 150, 170
religious cii, 135, 152, 154, 199–200
and scepticism lxxvii, cii, 116–18, 199–200
testimony as a basis for xxxii, lxxx–xciv, ciii, 38, 60, 81, 84–99, 171–4
see also credulity; evidence; faith; knowledge
Bellarmine, St Robert (Bayle on) xxxiii
benevolence 76, 103–4
Bentley, Richard xxxiii, 149, 183–4, 188–90, 192–3
Berkeley, George:
on abstract ideas 197–8
and atheism and free-thinking 116, 183, 192–3, 196
on causation and association xxviii, 134, 140, 155
on God and religion 165, 173, 185, 189, 192–3
his influence on Hume xxiv–viii, 197
Hume's praise of xxvi
on perception and the external world xxxv, lxxvii, xcv, 131–2, 194
on primary and secondary qualities 195–6
his scepticism xxxiv–v, xciv–v, xcviii, 116, 196, 307
Berman, David 192, 283
Bernoulli, J. 148–51
bias xxxii, lxxxvii, 163, 193; *see also* prejudices
Biblical miracles and stories xxxi, lxxxvi, 137, 185
bigotry 83, 93, 100
billiard-ball example 26–7, 40, 51, 56, 141, 143
Bishop of Tournay (Gilbert de Choiseul du Plessis-Praslin); *see* Choiseul, Gilbert de
Blair, Hugh lxxvi, xci, xciv, xcvi, 127, 136–7, 173, 185
Blanc, Abbé le xxii
Blount, Charles 176, 190, 283
blue, missing shade of 15, 133
body, bodies; *see* belief (in external objects); cohesion; intelligible qualities of the universe; soul (union with body); substance
Bolingbroke, Saint-John, Henry, Viscount lxxv, lxxxviii
Bonar, John lxxvi, 283
bookplates (Hume) 302
Box, M. A. v, xx, xlv, 129, 283
Boyle, Robert:
and atomism 189, 195
on belief and testimony 150, 172
on causation xxviii, 140, 148
and the design argument 189
on education 194
on faith and reason 200
on miracles 173
and natural philosophy 140, 157, 189
and science 140–1
on understanding, reason and ignorance 142, 150
Bracken, Harry M. 197, 284
Bramhall, John xxx, 139, 160–4
Breitinger, Heinrich 136
Briggs, John lxxvi
Browne, Peter 153
Browne, Thomas 141–2
Brutus, Marcus 183
Bruyère, Jean de La 6, 127–8, 276
Burke, Edmund 127, 199, 284

Burton, J. H. xliii, xcvi
Butler, Joseph:
  Hume's appraisal of xiii, xxiv, 130
  on miracles xxxii, 172–4, 185–6
  on probability as the guide of life xxix, 144
  and probable inference 139, 150–1, 156, 170
  as a religious philosopher 188–91

Cadell, Thomas xliv, liii–iv, lvi–vii, 208
Caesar, Gaius Julius 122, 135, 138, 183
Caledonian Mercury xx
Calvin, Jean 147
Campbell, Archibald 185, 200
Campbell, George xii, lxxxix–xci, xciii, c, 127, 139
canons of the church 93, 174
capitalization xli, lxi, 209, 214–16, 221–6, 281
Capuchins 89, 174
Cardano, Gerolamo 150
Cardinal de Retz; *see* Retz, Jean François Paul de Gondi
Carneades 145, 198
Cartes; *see* Descartes, René
Cartesian scepticism and theory xxxv, 112, 146, 151–3, 155–60, 193, 196; *see also* Cartesians; Descartes; Malebranche; occasionalism
Cartesians:
  on God and causal power xxviii, 58, 141, 159, 199
  Occasionalists as xxiv–v, xxviii–ix, 155–60, 165
  see also Descartes; god(s); occasionalism; scepticism
Casaubon, Méric 192
casuistry 178
catastrophe 22, 97
catchwords xlv, cv, 220
Catholic religion, Roman:
  canons of the church 93, 174
  ceremonies and images of 42, 135, 146
  and miracles xii, xxxi–ii, 92, 169–70, 173–4; *see also* miracles
  as paradigm of supernatural religion 130
  and real presence 146, 169–70
  see also miracles; mummeries; religion; theology
Cato the Elder 43, 147, 273
Cato the Younger 86, 172, 274
causation:
  analogies in reasoning from 26–7, 57, 79–80, 86, 111
  Berkeley on xxviii, 134, 140, 155
  Cartesians on God and xxviii, 58, 141, 159, 199
  causal mechanisms 55, 143, 158
  certainty in judgements of 51, 59, 66
  chance as absence of 46, 72, 148–50
  Clarke on xxviii, 149, 151
  and constant conjunction xxviii, lxxxiii, 37, 59, 63, 70–1, 73, 145, 162
  critiques of Hume's treatment of:
    in Beattie xcix
    in Kames lxxvi–vii
    in Leland lxxx–i
    in Manning lxxx
    in Price lxxxiii
    in Priestley ciii
    in Reid xciv, xcvi
  definition(s) of 'cause' 60, 72–4, 157, 164, 307
  Descartes on xxviii–ix, 58, 141, 156, 199
  energy and 50–2, 54–8, 61, 63, 109, 155, 308
  experience as basis of awareness of 25–47, 51–62, 67–8, 73, 79, 84–8, 98, 105–8, 111, 118–22

causation: (*cont.*)
final 45, 147–8
ignorance of relations of 19, 28–9, 32, 45–6, 50, 56–7, 60, 70, 118, 142–3, 149
and irregular events 67, 162
mechanical lxxviii–ix, 81, 169
and necessary connection xxviii–ix, lxxvii, lxxx–ii, 49–61, 70–2, 308
occasionalist theories of xxiv–v, xxix, 152, 154–7, 159
proof of relations of 53, 59, 61, 67
secret causes 11, 19, 26, 29–33, 36, 44–7, 53–6, 66–7, 72, 81, 151
uncertainty in 47, 50, 61, 66–7, 80, 84–5
see also induction; liberty and necessity; probability; reasoning
certainty:
in causal judgement 51, 59, 66
in common sense philosophy ci
degrees of 70, 84, 144, 149, 151
from experience 37, 40, 66, 69–71
and imagination 65
and miracles 92
moral 149, 170
in philosophy 11, 113, 117
and probable reasoning 29, 37, 47, 71, 81, 144, 148–9
in relations of ideas 24, 138
sentiments and 50–4, 57–61, 64, 66, 68, 118, 159
and the uniformity of nature lxxxii, 47, 81
see also probability; relations of ideas; uncertainty
Challe, Robert 172, 176
Chambers, Ephraim xxvii, 127, 132, 134, 139, 142–3, 149–51, 153, 157, 162–4, 171, 189, 192, 197, 201
chance:
as absence of causation 46, 72, 148–50
and the argument from design 102, 189–90
and atomism 189–90
Epicureans on 189–90
and liberty 72–3
its nature and nonexistence 46–7, 72, 149–50, 164
and probability 46–7, 135, 148–50
see also liberty and necessity; probability
chaos 14
Charing Cross 69, 162–3
Charleton, Walter 148, 189–90
Châtillon, duc de (Paul Sigismond de Montmorency) 95, 181, 275, 277
Cheyne, George xxxiii, 140, 153, 157, 163–4, 187–9, 192–3
Chillingworth, William 171, 200
chimera 49
Choiseul, Gilbert de (Bishop of Tournay) 95, 182, 273–4
Christ lxxxviii, 146, 169–70, 182
Christianity:
evidence of the truth of 83, 199
faith, not reason, its foundation 98–9, 185, 198–200, 307
and moral austerity 191
reports of miracles in xxxi–ii, lxxxi, xci–ii, 83, 98, 171–2, 176, 182–5
theological defenses of xxxi, lxxxvii, lxxxix, xci–ii, ci, 176, 189
theologians and philosophers of xxxiv
see also faith; miracles; religion; theology
Chrysippus 166
Cicero, Marcus Tullius:
eloquence of 127, 174
life and fame of 6, 128, 274
on mental suggestion 43, 147
his presentation of academic scepticism xxxiv, 145, 198
as a source for Hume xxv, xxxiii, xl, 144, 308

on theological matters xxxiii, 154–5
his view of Scipio 279
Clarke, Samuel:
against atheism 192
on causation xxviii, 149, 151
on infinite divisibility 197
his influence on Hume xxiv, xxx, xxxiii
on liberty 160
on miracles 173, 185
and natural philosophy 140
and Newton lxxix, 58, 157–9
and public morality 188
Clauberg, Johann 155–6
Cleghorn, William xx
Clephane, John xxxvii, xlvii
clergy xviii, 95
climate 83, 86
Clitomachus 198
Cochrane, J. A. xxxvi, xliv, 286
coherence 108–9
cohesion (of parts of matter) 27, 79, 140, 142, 166
collation of Hume's editions xl–i, xlvi–lxi, cv–vi, 156, 229
Collier, Arthur 194, 196
Collins, Anthony xxx, xxxii, lxxv, 130, 149, 160–4, 167, 182–4, 186–9
Colver, A. Wayne xxxviii, lv, cvi, 125, 286
common life:
appeals to 5–6, 35–6
argument from design and 109
causal issues remote from 58
contrasted to abstract reasoning 36, 62, 67, 116
liberty and necessity and 67, 73
occasionalism remote from 57, 78
reflection on 109, 121
scepticism and 35–6, 113, 118, 121
common sense 6, 89, 116, 120, 186, 197
common sense theory lxxvi, lxxxiii, xc, xcv, xcix–ciii, 6, 120
compositors xli–iv, cvii, 208, 210–13, 216, 220
Condillac, Étienne 131
connection (connexion), necessary; *see* causation
constant conjunction xxviii, lxxxiii, 37, 59, 63, 70–3, 145, 162; *see also* causation
contiguity:
as a principle of association xxvii, 17, 19, 23, 42–4, 308
in shades of colours 15
in time and place 17, 19, 135
see also association of ideas; causation
contradiction:
in abstract philosophy 116–18
in competing testimony 85–6, 97
not implied by matters of fact 14, 24, 31, 40
and limitations of reason 77–8
Copernican theory 119, 274
copytext, choice of xlii–iii, cv–vi, 206–28, 307
Cordemoy, Géraud de 155–6, 165; *see also* occasionalism; Cartesians
Cotes, Roger 130, 150
courage (of Alexander) 65, 161
Coutts, John xviii, xx
Craig, John 171
creation:
divine xxxiii, 137, 169, 190
Milton's account of 22, 137
of something out of nothing 54, 122
creator of the world 23, 56–7, 75
credibility in testimony for miracles xxxi, lxxx, lxxxv–vi, lxxxviii–ix, xciii, ciii, 173, 186; *see also* credulity; miracles
The Credibility of Miracles Defended (Rutherforth) lxxxv–vi
credulity 35, 89, 92–3, 96, 174; *see also* faith; implicit faith
Creech, W. lvii
creeds 100

criminal action lxxvi, 74–7, 92
critical apparatus vi, cvi
critical text cvi, 206–7, 212–20, 225–6
crucifixion xciii, 182
Cudworth, Ralph 58, 159, 192, 274
cures (miraculous) 92, 94–5, 176–81, 276–8; *see also* miracles; physicians
Curley, Edwin 201
Curtius Rufus, Quintus 161, 274, 304
custom, principle of:
  as basis of necessity 63, 70
  effect and influence of 26, 37–8, 66
  as guide of life 38, 119; *see also* probability
  and inference and reasoning xxviii, lxxix, 36–41, 44, 47, 59–61, 70, 80–1, 119, 308
  miracles contrary to 99
  in nonhuman animals 80–1, 168
  as principle of human nature xcvi, 37, 44, 59, 145, 159
  see also habit; causation; experience

Daston, Lorraine 148, 287
David, F. N. 148, 287
De finibus bonorum et malorum (Cicero) 43, 147
De rerum natura (Lucretius) 184, 189, 199, 276
deceit lxxvi, 177
deceitful reasoning 10, 112, 119
deception:
  avoiding through study 65, 71
  in claims of miracles 87–8, 96–7, 175
  consciousness never deceives 53
  of the senses lxxxvii, 115, 194
definition(s) and meaning(s):
  of 'animal œconomy' 162
  of 'animal spirits' 153
  of 'association' 17–18, 134
  of 'belief' 40, 146
  of 'cause' 60, 72–4, 157, 164, 307
  of 'chance' 46–7, 149–50
  and complex and simple ideas 50
  of 'credulity' 174
  of 'experience' xc
  in geometry 49, 152
  of 'God' 14
  of 'impression' and 'idea' 13, 16–17
  of 'inertia' 156
  of 'innate' 16
  of 'intuition' and 'demonstration' 144
  of 'justness' 189
  of 'liberty' and 'necessity' 62, 68, 70, 72–5, 164, 309
  of 'medium' 143
  of 'miracle' 87, 173, 309
  more and less accurate 121–2
  of 'necessary connexion' 50, 58
  of 'nisus' 154
  of 'power' 50, 58, 60–1
  of 'proofs' 46
  of 'sceptic' 112
  of 'substance' 196
  of 'taste' 127
  and verbal disputes 62–3, 71–2, 160, 163–4
  of 'vis inertiæ' 156
  see also meaning and meaninglessness; verbal disputes
deism lxxxiv, 156, 172
deists lxxxiv, 171, 173, 176, 182, 185, 200, 274, 277
deity, deities:
  in Cartesian thought 56, 141, 159, 199
  causal powers of the xxviii, 56, 58, 155
  and the design argument 103, 108
  and liberty and necessity 75–7, 110, 165
  proof of the 111–12
  and vice 104–5, 110
  volition of the 56, 87, 110, 165

see also god(s); providence
delusion 83, 88–91, 96
de Moivre; *see* Moivre, Abraham de
demagogues 107
Demetrius I of Macedonia 92, 177, 274
Democritus 189, 195
'Democritus' (pseud.) c–ci
demonstration:
and certainty and truth 24, 138
definition of 144, 202
demonstrative arguments and evidence 46, 117, 170
demonstrative reasoning xxvii–ix, lxxix–lxxx, 30–2, 117, 121–2, 139, 149
demonstrative science 138, 199
of God's existence xxxii, 102 ff., 193
intermediate ideas in 143
and intuition and induction 138, 144
knowledge and lxxx, lxxxv
limits and boundaries of 121–2
and proof of liberty 71
see also proof(s); relations of ideas
Demosthenes 89, 127, 174, 274
Dennis, John 138, 174
depravity 74
Descartes, René:
on animals xxx, 154, 166–9
on belief 146
on cause and effect xxviii–ix, 58, 141, 156, 199
on dualism 153, 156
on God and religion xxxiii, 58, 155–6, 158–9, 188, 193–4, 199
and infinite divisibility 197
influence on Hume xxiv, xxvii, xxix–xxx, xxxiii, xciv–v
on liberty 160, 164
life of xii, 274
on mathematics and science xxvi, 143
on magnetism 141
Meditations on First Philosophy xxiv, xxviii, xxx, xxxv, cvii, 133, 139, 146, 193–4, 199
on mind or perception 130, 133
on moral certainty 170
and natural philosophy 140, 143, 157
on the real presence 170
on reasoning 139, 144
and sceptical doubt xxvii–viii, xxxiv–v, xciv–v, xcviii, 112, 193, 196
see also Cartesian scepticism and theory
design, the argument from xxxiii, lxxxi, lxxxiii, lxxxix, cii, 102–3, 105, 107–9, 188–91; *see also* god(s); creation; providence
Desmaizeaux, Pierre lxxvi
Des Voeux, Antoine Vinchon 178
determinism lxxviii, xcix, 149, 189; *see also* liberty and necessity; causation
deus ex machina 55, 154–5
devil 94, 176
devotees 42–3
devotion 42–3, 93
Dialogues concerning Natural Religion (Hume):
examples and arguments in xxix, 186, 188–92, 200
passages cited from 129, 139–41, 148–9, 153, 156, 163, 165–6, 193
sources cited in xxxi–iv, 147, 185, 198
dice (and probabililty) 46, 150
Diderot, Denis 127, 150, 175–6
diffidence 59, 117
A Delineation of the Nature and Obligation of Morality (Balfour) xcvii–viii
Digby, Kenelm(e) 140–1, 167–8
Dio Cassius Cocceianus 187, 275, 304
Diodorus Siculus 137
Diogenes of Sinope 191
Diogenes Laertius 186, 198

disavowal of the *Treatise* xiv–xvi, xciv, 1; *see also* Advertisement
discernment 7, 13
A Dissertation on Miracles (Campbell) lxxxix–xci
A Dissertation on the Passions (Hume) xiv, xl–lvii, lx–i, 126, 129, 135, 138, 140, 145, 167, 174
divine being; *see* god(s); providence; Supreme Being
divines 95, 112
divinity, or theology 122–3
divisibility, infinite; *see* infinite divisibility
doctrine(s):
  of God's efficacy and providence 58, 102, 105, 110, 188, 190; *see also* creation; god(s); providence
  of impressions and ideas 15–16
  of infinite divisibility 116–18, 197–9
  of liberty and necessity 63–4, 68–76, 110, 163; *see also* liberty
  regarding the nature of belief 41; *see also* belief
  of transubstantiation xxxii, 83, 169–70; *see also* real presence; transubstantiation
Dodwell, Henry 200, 288
dogmas 100, 116
dogmatism xcvii, 12, 120
Domitian 177, 279
Donaldson, A. xlix–liv, lvi–vii
doubles 80, 167–8
Douglas, John lxxvi, lxxxii, c
Dryden, John 135, 174
Duc De Châtillon; *see* Châtillon

Edinburgh Advertiser lii, lvii
education:
  of animals 80, 168
  and bias and prejudice 81, 113, 193–4
  as criterion of credibility lxxxi, 88
  force of 66
Egyptian gods and religion 92, 176
elasticity 27, 166
Elizabeth I 97, 275
Elliot, Gilbert xv, civ, 139, 187
ellipsis 49, 152
Ellys, Anthony lxxxvii–viii
eloquence:
  of Alexander 91
  of Cato 274
  of Cicero and Demosthenes 127–8, 174
  as an obstacle to reason 61, 89
  use and value of 5, 89, 91, 101
emotions 13, 21, 23, 76–7, 88; *see also* passions
emperors 100, 145
energy lxxix, 50–2, 54–8, 61, 63, 109, 155, 308; *see also* causation; power(s)
An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals (Hume) xiv, xxii, xxxviii, xl, xliv, lix (and numerous references in the Introduction and Annotations designated '*EPM*')
entertainment 5, 19, 63
enthusiasm xiii, lxxxvii, 89, 94, 110, 130, 174, 178, 180, 191–2; *see also* superstition; zeal in religion and philosophy
epic poetry 19–22, 136–8, 275
Epictetus 35, 145, 275
Epicureans xxv, 119, 145, 163, 187–91, 197
Epicurus xxxiii, 100–1, 107, 110–11, 144–5, 187–93, 195, 275–6, 308
errata (Hume's) xxii, xlv, xlvii, xlix–l, 227, 230
Essay Concerning Human Understanding (Locke) xxiv, 148, 153, 276 (and numerous references in the Annotations designated 'Locke, *Essay*')
Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth (Beattie) xcviii–ciii, 171, 193

Essay in Answer to Mr. Hume's Essay on Miracles (Adams) lxxxvi–vii
Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion (Kames) lxxv–viii; *see also* Kames, Lord
etherial active fluid (ether) lxxviii–ix, 58, 158–9
Euclid and Euclidean geometry 24, 49, 139, 152, 199, 275
'Eumenes' (pseud.) c–ci
Eunuch (Lucian) 100, 187
Euripides 154
evidence:
  for the argument from design xxxiii, lxxxi
  of causal connections 25, 59, 119
  and certainty 24, 151
  for Christianity 83, 199
  degrees of 84, 148, 171
  experience as the source of 25–6, 29–30, 67–8, 84–5
  for miracles lxxxi, lxxxvi–xcii, 88–95, 171, 176, 179–80, 184–5, 309
  natural and moral lxxix–lxxx, 69, 84, 118, 148, 162, 170, 308
  proportioning belief to 83–4, 182
  from the senses 24–5, 83–5, 113–14, 116, 119
  Tillotson on 148–9, 169
  truth and 26, 73, 83, 85, 98, 113
  see also experience; proof(s); testimony
evil xcvii, 44, 74, 104, 187, 190; *see also* ill(s)
excusable doubts and errors 11, 24
executioner 69
experience:
  of animals 79–81
  as the basis of causal knowledge 25–47, 51–62, 118–22
  as the basis of inference lxxxiv, xcii, 29–47, 67–8, 73, 79, 84–8, 98, 105–8, 111, 151
  certainty from 29, 37, 40, 51, 66, 69–71
  and command of the will 52–4
  and ignorance 33, 38, 79
  and miracles 83–8, 98
  nature of xc
  physicians' knowledge from 37, 64, 67
  proofs from 31–2, 84, 87, 139
  reason and 37
  resemblance, as a means of going beyond 79, 81, 88, 111, 114, 166
  as source of evidence, proof, and judgement 25–37, 67–8, 84–5
  uniformity of nature not certified by ciii, 26, 31–3
  when identical with reason 37–8
  see also causation; custom; habit; experimentation; inference; miracles; probability
experimentation:
  conclusions from 31–2, 144
  experimental philosophy 140–3, 157–8
  experimental science xxiv–v, 42–3, 58–9, 64–5, 130
  methods of xxvi, 126, 130, 157, 193
  and phænomena 50, 142
  as observation and experience 64–5, 144
  reasoning grounded in xxiv, 32, 47–8, 68, 79, 81, 121, 123, 130, 308
  see also natural philosophy; science
extension (as property of the physical) xcv, 51, 115–17, 195, 197

fables, unity in 20–2, 308–9
fact; *see* matters of fact
faculties of the mind:
  imagination; *see* imagination
  limits of lxxxiii, 10, 14, 37, 57, 70, 121

faculties of the mind: (*cont.*)
memory and reason 13, 25, 36, 103; *see also* memory; reason
role in Hume's system lxxxiii, 10
scepticism about 112–13, 121
taste; *see* taste
understanding; *see* understanding
the will; *see* will
see also association of ideas; imagination; memory; mind(s); reason; scepticism; taste; understanding
fairy land 57
faith:
Christian religion founded in 98–9, 122, 185, 198–200, 307
implicit 24, 139
in miracles and transubstantiation 170, 179
in the senses and testimony 113, 174
see also belief; Christianity; credulity; religion
fallacies:
of atheists 112, 192; *see also* atheism
and mental faculties 112–13, 119
in reasoning 45, 106, 108, 112
famine 90
fancy 20, 26, 40, 42, 56, 89, 117; *see also* imagination
Fermat, Pierre de 148, 150
fictions 40, 146
fideism 199–200
Fieser, James v
final causes 45, 147–8
Flavian family 92, 177
folly 9, 98
Fontenelle, Bernard le Bovier de 185, 288
fools 90; *see also* impostors
fortuitous concourse of atoms 102, 189
Fosl, Peter v
Foucher, Simon 138, 195
Four Dissertations (Richard Price) xci–iii
fraud 38, 93, 96, 184
free will; *see* determinism; liberty and necessity
free-thinkers lxxv, xcix, 95, 116, 182–4, 186–8; *see also* atheism; libertine thought
freedom xii, 13, 69, 100, 145, 163–4, 274; *see also* determinism; liberty and necessity
Fréret, Nicolas 173–4, 176, 185
Frey, Raymond v
future state xxxi, lxxxi, cii, 100–2, 186, 188, 190; *see also* immortality

Gabriel 122, 199
Galilei, Galileo xxvi, 140, 143, 157, 195
gaming 150
Gaskell, Philip xxxvi, 289
Gassendi, Pierre:
on animals 167–8
on Aristotle 128, 193
on the association of ideas xxvii
on atomism 189
on causation 148, 158
on imagination 132
on induction and probability 144, 150
on natural instincts 146
and natural philosophy 130, 157
on perception and experience 131–3, 194, 196
and scepticism 193–5
Gawlick, Günter 75, 289
Gay, John 134
Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser liv–v
Gee, Arnold 147
General Evening-Post xlvi, xlviii, liv, lvi
generosity c, 15, 64; *see also* benevolence
genius ci, 7–9, 18, 80, 92–3, 95, 102, 131, 135, 308–9

Gentleman's Magazine xv, xlvi
geometry 24, 28, 49–50, 117–18, 138, 143, 152; *see also* mathematics
Gerard, Alexander xciii, c, 199
Geulincx, Arnold 156
Gilbert, William 141
Glanvill, Joseph xxviii, 128–30, 139–40, 142, 148, 159, 189, 193–4
god(s):
  analogies and claims about lxxvii, 57, 108–9, 191
  argument from design for the existence of xxxiii, lxxxi, lxxxiii, lxxxix, cii, 102–3, 105, 107–9, 188–91
  Berkeley on religion and 165, 173, 185, 189, 192–3
  Cartesian occasionalists on xxviii, 58, 141, 159, 199
  creation by xxxiii, 23, 56–7, 75, 137, 169, 190
  definition of 14
  Descartes on religion and xxxiii, 58, 155–6, 158–9, 188, 193–4, 199
  Egyptian 92, 176
  Epicurus's arguments regarding 101 ff., 187–90
  infinity of 14, 54, 75–6, 154
  miracles (Biblical) performed by xxxi, lxxxvi, 83, 94, 137, 185
  in occasionalist theory; *see* Cartesians; Clauberg; Cordemoy; La Forge; Malebranche; occasionalism
  providence of 101, 188, 190–3
  punishment by lxxxi, lxxxvii, 105–6, 108, 110, 186
  as Supreme Being(s) 54, 56–7, 109, 115, 122, 156, 193–4
  Tillotson on 187–8, 192–3
  see also deity, deities; providence; Supreme Being
golden-mountain example 14, 132
Goodich, Michael E. 174, 289
government 37, 56, 66–8, 102, 108, 110; *see also* politics
Gravesande, W. James s' 139–40, 142–3, 171
gravity (laws of) lxxviii–ix, 27, 47, 58, 142, 150–1, 158
Green, T. H. 227
Gregory, John xciii
Greig, J. Y. T. 125
Grose, T. H. 227, 289
Grotius, Hugo xxxii, 171, 176, 185, 189
Guthrie, W. K. C. 187, 290

habit:
  and explanation of human nature xcvi, 10, 37, 145, 168
  as guide of life 37–8, 81; *see also* probability
  and inference and reasoning xxviii, 37, 55, 59–61, 80–1, 308
  see also causation; custom; experience; inference
Hacking, Ian 148, 290
Hald, Anders 148, 290
Halyburton, Thomas 200
happiness 5, 18, 76–7, 105, 200
harangue 101, 107
Hardouin, Louise xxxii, 179
Harvey, William 166–7
hatred 35, 39, 74, 101
haughtiness 120
healing lxxxvii, 175–6, 180, 183; *see also* cures; miracles
heart:
  bodily organ of the 52, 99, 166
  feelings and motives of the 5–6, 15, 23
Hector 20, 22, 136
Helen of Troy 8, 20, 136
Henriade (Voltaire) 20, 136, 280
Herault, René 94, 178, 180–1, 275
Herbert of Cherbury cvii, 133, 146, 192

Hernlund, Patricia xxxvi, 290
Herodotus xxxii, 95, 183, 275, 304
heroes 19–21, 136–7
Hesiod 190
Hillyard, Brian 290, 302
Hippocrates 64, 161, 275
historian(s) 18–20, 68, 85, 90, 92, 95, 97, 99
Histories (Tacitus) 64, 92, 161, 176–7, 279
History (Herodotus) xxxii, 95, 183, 275
History of Alexander (Quintus Curtius Rufus) 161
Hoadly, Benjamin 183
Hobbes, Thomas:
  atheism attributed to 164, 187, 192
  his attack on the schoolmen 134
  on connexions between ideas xxvii, 134–6, 146
  and the golden mountain example 132
  on implicit faith 139
  his *Leviathan* xxvii, xxx, xxxii, 125, 130, 132–5, 139, 144, 146, 164, 173–4, 186
  on liberty and necessity xxx, 160–1, 163–5
  on miracles xxxii, 173, 186
  on morals 131
  on probability 139
  religious scepticism of xxxiii, 130, 193
  his scepticism of the senses 194
  and scientific method in philosophy xxvi, 144, 157
Holcomb, Kathleen xciii, 291
holy cause 89, 96
holy Spirit 83
holy fraud 93; *see also* pious frauds
holy thorn, miracle of the 95–6, 181–4
Home, Alexander xxi
Homer 22, 136–7, 275, 304, 308
honour(s):
  as bestowal of respect 1, 35, 105
  the virtue of 5, 65, 74, 104
Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus) 138, 146
human nature, science of xxv–vi, 1, 5, 10, 12, 31, 37, 64–5, 126, 129, 167; *see also* science; *A Treatise of Human Nature*
Hume, Baron David 302
humours 76, 165
Hurd, Richard lxxv
Hutcheson, Francis xv–xvii, xxiv, xxviii, xxxiv, lxxvi, 128–30, 135, 145
Hylas (in Berkeley) 153, 183, 196
hypothenuse 24, 121
hypotheses:
  regarding animals 153, 159, 168
  in atomic theory 189–90
  from causal reasoning 37, 79
  religious lxxxix, 103, 105–6, 109–10, 154, 190
  sceptical xcv, xcviii
  scientific lxxix, 58, 143, 157–9

ideas; *see* abstract (general) ideas; association of ideas; images; impression(s); innate ideas; perception(s); relations of ideas
ignorance:
  of causal relations 19, 28–9, 32, 45–6, 50, 56–7, 60, 70, 118, 142–3, 149
  despise of 6–7
  of events 19, 90–1, 99
  as excuse for acting 74–5
  and experience 33, 38, 79
  natural state of 26, 28, 32, 50, 79
  of operations of the mind 10, 12, 70
Ikeda, Sadao v, 285
Iliad (Homer) 20, 135–7, 275
ill(s), moral and physical 22, 76–7, 94, 104; *see also* evil

illusions 6, 121–3, 175
images:
  religious 42–3, 135, 147
  and sense perception xcv, 113–15, 131–2
  used in ideas and thoughts 56, 71, 114, 117
imagination:
  and animals 80, 168
  and the association of ideas 17–18
  and belief 40–1, 44, 46–7, 80
  and connexion 21–3, 27, 59–61
  and custom 40, 59, 80
  fancy as 20–2, 26, 40, 42, 56, 89, 117
  fictions of 40–1, 46–7
  and ideas 41, 132
  passions and 11, 18, 20–3, 41, 47, 76, 89
  and reasoning 104, 120
  senses and 13–16, 39–41, 44, 52, 80, 118, 131
  and volition 52
immortality xxxii, 122, 148, 153, 165–6, 188, 190–1, 308; *see also* future state
impartiality 108, 112, 116
impiety 76, 96, 122, 184, 187; *see also* atheism; irreligion; piety
implicit faith 24, 139; *see also* credulity; faith
impostors 90, 216, 272, 307; *see also* Alexander the false prophet
impostures 90–1, 95
impressions:
  and causal power xxix, xcix, 51–2, 54, 59, 61, 108
  causes of 194
  definition and meaning of 13–17, 132, 308
  doctrine of lxxxiii, xcv, xcviii–ix, 14–16, 50–2, 54, 61, 131, 133
  and ideas lxxxiii, xcviii–ix, 13–16, 41–4, 50–2, 61, 131–2, 146
  inward and outward 16, 133
  of the will 163
  see also perception(s); senses
impudence 89
impulse (and motion) 26–7, 37, 40, 47, 51, 56–7, 59, 141, 154–5; *see also* motion
inclination(s):
  and actions and motives 65, 72–3
  and custom and education 66
  of human nature 35, 64–6, 85, 90–1, 95, 108–9
  and necessity 73
incredibility lxxx, xciii, 86, 88; *see also* credibility in testimony for miracles; Indian Prince incredulous about ice
Indian Prince incredulous about ice lxxxviii, xc, 86, 151, 172–3
indifference (and liberty) 71, 75, 77, 163–4; *see also* liberty and necessity
indolence 10, 35
induction xxviii–ix, lxxvi, lxxix–lxxxv, xc–iv, ciii, 139, 143–4
indulgence 35, 110, 120
industry 7, 9, 104, 108
inertia lxxviii, lxxix, 156–7; *see also* gravity; science
infallible operations 45, 51–2, 55, 59, 114–15, 134
infancy, human lxxxix, 45, 66
inference:
  analogies involving 26–7, 57, 79–80, 86, 111
  in animals xxx, 79–80, 168
  causal or probable; *see* causation, probable inference
  from custom and habit xxviii, lxxix, 36–41, 44, 47, 55, 59–61, 70, 80–1, 119, 308
  to a divine being 56, 103–5, 107–8, 111, 191

inference: (*cont.*)
experience as basis of lxxxiv, xcii, 29–47, 67–8, 73, 79, 84–8, 98, 105–8, 111, 151
grounded in instinct xcii, 45, 119, 168–9
and mechanistic association xxvii, 45, 81, 134, 169
and miracles xxxii, 172–4, 185–6
necessity involved in 63–4, 68–73
and uniformity of nature lxxxii, 31, 47, 87–8, 97–8, 108, 151
see also causation; induction; probable inference; proof(s); reason; understanding
infidel writers (Bolingbroke and Hume) xxi, lxxxiv, lxxxviii
infinite divisibility xxxiv, 116–18, 197–9
infinite improbability xcii
infinity of God 14, 54, 75–6, 154
injustice 121
innate ideas 16, 133
Inquiry into the Grounds and Nature of the Several Species of Ratiocination (Manning) lxxix–lxxx, 294
Inquiry into the Human Mind (Reid) xciv–vi, cii
insensible movement 42
instinct:
contrasted to other faculties xcv, xcix, 114, 116, 168
in humans and animals 80–2, 168–9
inference and reason based on xcii, 45, 119, 169
and scepticism xcvii–viii, 121
and the senses 113–16
and sentiment and feeling 39, 146
Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion (Priestley) xciii, cii–iii
integrity lxxxi, 88, 93–4
intelligence 56, 70, 102–5, 107, 169
intelligible definitions 62–3, 72–3
intelligible propositions 16, 24, 31, 37, 122
intelligible qualities of the universe 53, 55, 115–16
intentions:
of the Deity 75–6, 109, 158
in human action 18–19, 53, 68, 191
see also motive(s)
intuitive connections and proofs 24, 30, 32, 71, 138–9, 144, 170
invention 26–7, 50, 138
irregularity in nature 47, 67, 151
irreligion 36, 196; *see also* atheism; impiety; miracles; religion
Islam 176; *see also* Mahomet; Arabs
isosceles triangle 49, 116

Jackson, John 171–3, 176, 185
Jansen, Cornelius 177, 181, 275
Jansenists xxxi, 93–5, 177–3, 273–80, 308
jealousy 100–1
Jessop, T. E. v, lviii, 292
Jesuits 93, 95, 177–8, 180–1, 183, 275
Jesus xciii, 171–3, 176, 181
Jewish religion xxxi, lxxxix, xciii, 94
Johnson, Samuel xxxvi, xliv, 135, 151
judicature 96
justice 106, 108, 121
justification xxi, xxxv, lxxxiv, 101–2, 105, 114
justness 38, 102, 189

Kames (Henry Home), Lord xii, xvii, xxviii, lxxv–viii, xcvii, cii, 155–6, 189
Keill, James 162, 166
Keill, John 129–30, 148, 189
Kepler, Johannes 130, 156
Kincaid, A. xlix–liv, lvi
King, William 147, 163–5
knavery 93, 98
knights-errant 112

knowledge:
in animals 79, 81
causal 19, 25–47, 51–62, 70, 103, 107, 109, 118–22
custom and 44
and demonstration lxxx, lxxxv
and doubt 115
of God 103, 107–9
Locke on the basis of 132, 148, 171–2, 185
from senses and experience 25–9, 31–2, 36
of real existence 39, 63
see also belief; experience; reasoning
Kreimendahl, Lothar 75, 289
Kreiser, B. Robert 179–80, 292
Kuehn, Manfred lxxv, 293

La Bruyère, Jean de 6, 127–8, 276
La Flèche xii, 178
La Forge, Louis de 155–6
Laelius, Gaius 43, 147, 276
Laird, John 149, 293
La Mettrie, Julien Offrey de 146, 167–9
La Mothe le Vayer, François de 139, 193, 200
language:
and communication among animals 166, 168
and the meaning of words 17, 40, 46, 50, 61–2, 73, 121
and verbal disputes 62–3, 71–3, 121, 160, 163–4
see also definition(s) and meaning(s); language; meaning and meaninglessness; verbal disputes
Laplanders 15, 133
laws (causal):
the deity and 56, 75–6, 104
experience and knowledge of 26, 28, 97
of gravitation 158, 277
of human behaviour and thought 11
irregularities in 67
and liberty and necessity 74–6
miracles as violations of lxxxv, lxxxviii–xc, ciii, 86–7, 96–8, 173, 183
of motion lxxviii–ix, 28
of nature xxx, lxxxviii–xc, ciii, 26, 28, 63, 87, 96–8, 108, 142, 173, 183, 186
scientific xxvi, 11, 28, 142, 157
see also causation; determinism; miracles
Lee, Henry 153
Leechman, William xvii, 192
Le Franc (Lefranc), Anne 94, 180, 276
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm:
and Arnauld 147
and Clarke 140, 157–8
and experimental method xxvi, 140
on final causes 148
on harmony in nature 76, 165
on implicit faith 139
his influence on Hume xxx, xxxiii
on internal power 153–4
on the measurement of force 159
on moral certainty 170
on natural instinct 146
on necessary connection xxix
on probability xxix, 144, 151
on reasoning in animals 168
his *Theodicy* 147, 276
Leland, John lxxx–iii, 191, 200
A Letter from a Gentleman (Hume) xviii–xx, xxiv–v, xxviii, xxxii, xxxiv, lxi, lxviii, lxxiv, 139, 141, 155–6, 159, 164, 169–70, 188, 190, 192–3, 198, 230
Leucippus 189
Leviathan (Hobbes) xxvii, xxx, xxxii, 125, 130, 132–5, 139, 144, 146, 164, 173–4, 186
liars 64, 198

libertine thought 36, 93; *see also* atheism; free-thinkers; irreligion
liberty and necessity:
and chance 72–3
controversy about, as dispute of words 62–3, 71–2, 308; *see also* verbal disputes
definition(s) and meaning(s) of 62, 68, 70, 72–5, 164, 309
Descartes on 160, 164
as essential to morals 73–5, 162
and God 75–7, 110, 165
Hobbes on xxx, 160–1, 163–5
indifference and 71, 75, 77, 163–4
and judgements in common life 67, 73
and necessary connection xxix–xxx, lxxvi, xcvii, 62–3, 71–5, 139, 160, 165, 308
reconciling theory of 62–78, 160–5
see also causation; determinism; freedom; will
licence of conjecture 103, 108–9
Lipsius, Justus 165
Lives (Plutarch) 137, 172, 177, 183, 188
Lives of the Caesars (Suetonius) 146, 176, 279
Livy (Titus Livius) 92, 98, 176, 276
loadstone (lodestone) 26, 140–1
Locke, John:
his attacks on schoolmen 16, 134
on the basis of knowledge 132, 148, 171–2, 185
Berkeley's criticisms of xxxv, 195, 199
on demonstration 46, 139, 143–4, 149, 151
on determinism and freedom xxx, 160, 164
on education 194
on expermiental reasoning in philosophy xxiv–vi, 128, 130, 143–4
on faith 185, 200
on God and natural religion xxxii–iii, 159
on ideas 132–5, 138–9, 146, 152, 197, 199
on the imagination 132
his influence on Hume xxiv–vii, xxix, xxxi, lxxxiii, cii–iii, 6, 128–9, 131–2, 140, 142, 148, 151, 163, 194–5, 308
on miracles xxxii, 151
on morals 145
and opposition to Aristotelian logic 128
on the perception of objects xxvii, xxxv, lxxxiii, 132, 152, 194
on power and causation xxvii, xxix, 51, 58, 134, 141, 152–3, 194, 199
on probability xxix, xxxii, 46, 143–4, 148–9, 151
on primary and secondary qualities 152, 195
on the reason of animals xxxi, 167–8
and scepticism xxxiv–v, xcv, xcviii, cii
on the soul 153
logic:
and argumentation 33, 57
Aristotelian 128
and the faculty of reasoning 131
as a science 129
logicians 12, 131
London Chronicle li–ii, lvi
London Evening-Post xlvi, xlix–liv
Longinus 127, 199
love 5, 13, 16, 35, 39, 64, 88–9, 100, 118
Lucan (Marcus Lucanus) 138
Lucian 90–1, 100, 175, 187, 272, 276, 304, 307–8
Lucretius xxxii, 96, 184–5, 189, 195, 199, 276, 304, 308
Lyttelton, George 175

Maclaurin, Colin 140, 143, 158, 189
madness 13, 114, 129, 135, 194
magic 98, 133, 175
Mahomet 92, 176; *see also* Arabs; Islam
Malebranche, Nicolas:
  on animal spirits 154
  on causation and power xxviii–ix, 58, 141, 143, 152, 309
  fame of 6, 128
  on ideas and human understanding 129, 134, 142, 151, 165
  his influence on Hume xxiv, xxvii–ix, xxxiii
  his occasionalism 58, 152, 155–6, 158–9, 165
  on projecting impressions onto objects 131–2, 159–60
  on sceptics 145
  on science 128, 141, 158
malice 101
Mandeville, Bernard xxiv, 130
Manning, Owen lxxix–lxxx, 294
manners 5, 8, 15, 35, 66, 74, 89, 95
marble (cohesion of) 26, 103, 140, 142
Mariana, Juan de xxxii, 95, 184, 277, 305
marvellous events 85–6, 89–91, 172, 174
mathematics:
  advantages of 49, 309
  algebra 24, 138
  conclusiveness of 49, 143
  foundation of xcvii, 118, 309
  geometry 24, 28, 49–50, 117–18, 138, 143, 152
  mathematical points 117–18, 197
  mixed 28, 143
  and reasoning in lxxxiv, 28, 50, 118
  and relations of ideas 49
  as science xi, 24, 49, 118, 122, 129, 138, 199
  see also relations of ideas
matter; *see* atoms and atomism; belief (in external objects); cohesion; intelligible qualities of the universe; substance
matters of fact 24–5, 38, 72, 83, 144; *see also* relations of ideas
maxims:
  about cause and effect 67, 84–5, 109
  derived from reflection 37–8
  governing everyday life 80, 88, 109, 113
  Hume's 16, 133, 173
  of moral philosophy 65–6
  of natural philosophy 38, 81, 88
  necessity of experience in formation of 37–8, 65, 81
  regarding testimony 85, 87, 97
Mazarin, Cardinal Jules 183, 272
meaning and meaninglessness (of words) 40, 46, 50, 58, 61–2, 72–3, 121, 133, 149, 164, 196; *see also* definition(s) and meaning(s); language; words
mechanics lxxviii–ix, 140–1, 143, 159–60
mechanisms, causal 55, 143, 158; *see also* causation
mechanistic association and inference xxvii, 45, 81, 134, 169
Meditations on First Philosophy (Descartes) xxiv, xxviii, xxx, xxxv, 133, 139, 146, 193–4, 199
medium 30, 32, 94, 106, 113, 121, 143
melancholy 7
Mémoires (Retz) 177, 279
memory:
  and belief 24–5, 36, 38–9, 44
  and causal reasoning 38, 40–2, 58, 60, 63, 69, 81, 119
  and certainty 13, 24–5, 36, 38, 44, 58, 119
  errors of 85
  of experiences 38, 85, 147
  human and animal faculties of 168

memory: (*cont.*)
ideas of 13, 17, 44
mensuration 61
Mérian, Jean-Bernard lviii
Mersenne, Marin xii, xxx, 142, 168, 193, 198
Metamorphoses (Ovid) 135, 190, 278
metaphysics:
contrasted to moral philosophy 28, 50, 73, 110, 113, 129, 149
criticism of Hume's xcvi, civ
and the existence of God 110, 113, 154, 158, 199
issues of xxiv, 72
nature of 309
obscurity in and limits of 7, 10, 16, 50, 131, 197
and occasionalism 58, 159
of the schools 123, 200
as source of errors xxvi, 9, 170
truth and falsity in xcvi, 9–10, 117
see also atoms and atomism; causation; determinism; future state; liberty and necessity; miracles; natural philosophy; providence
Middleton, Conyers xxxii, xxxvi, lxxiv, lxxxvii, 173, 175–6, 178–9, 295
military expedition 91
Millar, Andrew xxxvi, xxxix–xl, xliv, xlvi–liv, lxxv, 175, 210
Milton, John vi, 22, 137–8, 277, 305, 309
mind(s):
analogies in operations of 39–41, 44
ignorance of operations of 10, 12, 70
reflection on operations of 10, 49, 52, 70
scepticism about 112–13, 121
and sentiments 5, 13–15, 49–51, 54, 61, 77
and union with body 52, 56, 131, 153–4
see also faculties of the mind; soul
minuteness 66, 161
miracles:
Biblical xxxi, lxxxvi, 83, 94, 137, 185
Butler on xxxii, 172–4, 185–6
Catholic religion and xii, xxxi–ii, 92, 169–70, 173–4
Clarke on 173, 185
credibility in testimony for xxxi, lxxx, lxxxv–vi, lxxxviii–ix, xciii, ciii, 173, 186
deception in claims of 87–8, 96–7, 175
definition of 'miracle' 87, 173, 309
evidence for lxxxi, lxxxvi–xcii, 88–9, 91–5, 171, 176, 179–80, 184–5, 309
as the foundation of religion xxxi, lxxxvii, lxxxix, xci, 89–92, 96–9, 174, 182–3, 185–6
from the holy thorn 95–6, 181–4
pagan xxxii, lxxxvi, lxxxix
proof(s) of 86–8, 94–9, 173, 182, 185
as refuting atheism 95
reports of Christian xxxi–ii, lxxxi, xci–ii, 83, 98, 171–2, 176, 182–5
Spinoza on 173, 186
superstition and lxxxii, lxxxvii, 83, 92, 96
testimony in support of lxxx–ciii, 83–99, 171–4, 178, 180
Tillotson on 169–70, 173, 185
witnesses to lxxxi, lxxxiv, lxxxvii–viii, xc, xcii–iii, 83–6, 91–4, 171–4, 180
see also evidence; god(s); laws; testimony
misery 76, 104–5
mitigated scepticism xcv, xcvii, 120–1, 198; *see also* scepticism
mixed mathematics 28, 143
Moivre, Abraham de 148–51
Molina, Luis de 177, 180, 277
Molinism 94, 178, 180, 277, 280, 309

monkish historians 95
Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de:
on atomism 189
on belief xxviii
on discipline and education 168
essay on Raymond Sebond xxx, xxxiv, 142, 146, 166–8, 189, 194, 198, 200
on faith and reason 185, 200
on ignorance 142
his influence on Hume xxviii, xxxiv
and limits of the understanding 129, 185, 200
and natural instinct 146
and probability xxix
on reason in animals xxx, 146, 166–8
on reliability of the senses xxxiv, 194
and scepticism of xxxiv, 129, 185, 194, 198, 200
Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat, Baron de 127
Montgeron, Louis Basile Carré de xxxii, 94, 178–81, 277, 305
Montmorency, Paul Sigismond de; *see* Châtillon, Duc de
Montmort, Rémond de 148, 150, 171
moral certainty 149, 170
moral evidence lxxix, lxxx, 69, 84, 118, 148, 162, 170
moral ill; *see* ill(s), moral and physical
moral philosophy lxxxiii, xcvii–viii, 5, 50, 126, 129, 131, 274, 278
moral sciences 50, 126
morals (morality):
atheism as threat to 112, 164, 188
decay of 73, 101
determinism and praise or blame in 11, 68, 75, 77, 123, 127
Hume's alleged threat to xvii, xxxiv, lxxv, cii, 105, 118, 164, 188
liberty and necessity as essential to 73–5, 162
moral turpitude 75–7
philosophy of 5, 11, 28, 37, 49–50, 64, 73, 126, 128–9, 131, 145
providence (divine) and 101, 188, 190–1
religion and lxxxvii, cii, 35, 73–4
sentiments and xxiii, xcvii–viii, 5, 8, 11, 68, 75, 77, 123, 127
as a species of evidence lxxx, 69, 84, 118, 170, 308
as a species of reasoning lxxix–lxxx, 30, 498, 84, 118, 122, 126, 144, 149, 162, 170
see also moral philosophy
More, Henry xxx, xxxiii, 167, 169, 188, 191–2
Mossner, Ernest C. xxxiv, 295
motion:
idea of 26–9, 40, 61, 141
impulse and 26–7, 37, 40, 47, 51, 56–7, 59, 141, 154–5
laws of lxxviii–ix, 11, 27–8, 47, 57–8, 63, 69, 141–3, 157–9
and necessary connection 26–9, 40, 47, 51, 58–61, 69, 141, 155
as a primary quality 115, 195
Stewart on lxxviii–ix
willed and voluntary 52–4, 56–8, 61, 71, 153, 155
see also impulse
motive(s):
as causes of action lxxxvii, 64–73, 108, 161–2, 170
of the heart 5–6, 15, 23
to be moral 74, 161–2, 170
virtue and 5, 145, 191
and the will 65, 71–3
mummeries (in Roman Catholicism) 42, 146
Mure, William xviii, xl, 192
Muscovy 86, 173
'My Own Life' (Hume) xiii, xvi–xvii, xix, xxi, xxxvi, lxxiv–v, xcviii, civ, 175, 215

mysterious principles and subjects 52–3, 77, 89–90, 165, 170

narration and narratives 18–22, 65, 89, 135–6, 161
The Natural History of Religion (Hume) 126, 130, 133, 138–40, 145, 149, 154, 163, 165, 169, 174, 176, 190–1, 194
natural philosophy:
  and the design argument 189
  experimental method in 26, 50, 64, 126, 157
  and mathematics 28, 143
  nature of 122, 126, 129, 140, 152
  necessity in 73
  perception and scepticism in 157
  and phaenomena 130, 140
  see also moral philosophy
necessary connection xxviii–ix, lxxvii, lxxx–ii, 49–61, 70–2, 308; *see also* causation; liberty and necessity
necessity; *see* causation; liberty and necessity
negligence in reasoning xiv, 1, 11
Neret, Blaise 181, 277
Nero 38, 145–6, 277, 279
nerves 45, 53, 76, 153; *see also* animal spirits
new philosophy 57, 157, 193
Newton, Isaac:
  on gravitational attraction lxxviii–ix, 58, 130, 142–3, 150, 158, 166
  on hypotheses xxvi, 142–3
  and inertia 156–7
  his influence on Hume xxiv–vi, xxxiii, lxxviii–ix, 130–1, 142, 160
  his method applied to philosophy xxvi, 126, 142, 157
  and momentum 61, 159
  and second causes 58, 157–9
Newtonian theory lxxviii, 140, 143, 159–60; *see also* Newton
Nicole, Pierre xxvii, xxix, xxxi–ii, 95, 129, 131–3, 138–9, 141–2, 144, 148, 151, 170, 173, 178, 181, 194, 197–200, 273, 277
Nidditch, Peter H. v, 201, 227
Ninewells xi, xiii, xx
nisus 54, 61, 154, 160, 309
Noailles, Louis-Antoine de 94, 179–80, 277, 280
Norton, David Fate v, xii–xiii, xl, cv, 201, 302
Norton, Mary J. xl, 201, 302
Novum organum (Bacon) xxiv, cvii, 128–9, 133, 144, 185, 273
Noxon, James lx, 295
nuns 95, 182–3

oar, sceptics' example of 113, 194
oblique narration 21, 136
occasionalism xxiv–v, xxix, 152, 154–7, 159; *see also* Cartesians; Descartes; Malebranche
occult qualities xxix, 142, 158
Ockham, William of xxix, 141
odiousness 105
Odyssey (Homer) 21, 136, 137, 275
oeconomy (œconomy) 11, 62, 67, 76, 82, 162, 166, 169, 203
offices 53
omens 90, 183; *see also* oracles; prophecies
omnipotence 55–6
Ophiomaches (also *Deism Revealed*) (Skelton) lxxxiv, 172
opium 47, 151, 162
oppression 110
Opticks (Newton) xxvi, 126, 130, 140, 142, 150, 157–8, 160, 189
optics 50
oracles 90, 175, 177, 183, 185, 272; *see also* prophecies
orations 139, 143, 171, 274
orators 121, 273–4, 276, 279; *see also*

Cicero; Demosthenes; eloquence
oratory 128, 174, 276
Origen 185
'Orthodoxus' c
orthography 209, 211, 215, 221–2
Oswald, James, of Dunnikier xix–xxi
Oswald, Revd James xciv, ci–iii
Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso) 18, 135, 138, 190, 278, 305
Owen, David v

pagan miracles xxxii, lxxxvi, lxxxix
pain 13–14, 17, 33, 41, 44, 76, 80; *see also* pleasure
painters, painting (in philosophy) 5, 8, 103, 129; *see also* anatomy
palsy 53
pamphlets lxxiv–vi, 179, 183
panegyric 109
papal condemnations and bulls 178–9, 181, 278
Paradise Lost (Milton) 137, 277
paradoxes (sceptical) 100–1, 113, 118, 160
paralysis 180–1, 276
Pardies, Ignace-Gaston xxx, 167
Pâris, François (Abbé Pâris) lxxxii, 20, 93–4, 177–82, 276–9
partizans 35
Pascal, Blaise:
  on custom xxviii–ix, 145
  on faith and reason 185, 199–200
  his Jansenism 177–8, 181–2
  and miracles xxxii, 95, 309
  on natural instincts 146
  on probability xxviii–ix, 148, 150
passions:
  agitations of 6, 13, 20, 49
  biases from 7, 81
  calm 101
  as causes of action 18, 64, 74–5
  enthusiastic and religious; *see* superstition
  excitement of 35, 42, 74
  and imagination 11, 18, 20–3, 41, 47, 76, 89
  influences on 35, 39, 47
  and miracles 88–90, 85–6, 310
  as motives 18
  poets' arousal of 20–2, 68
  reason and 39, 49, 101
  restraints on 110
  and scepticism 35
  as sources of ideas 15–16, 40–2, 79
  surprise and wonder as 88
  transferred between like objects 20–2
  the vulgar and 89–90, 174
  see also emotions
Peloponnesian War 22, 137
Pensées (Pascal) xxviii, xxxii, lix, 145–6, 175–6, 182, 186, 200, 278
Pentateuch 98, 186
perception(s):
  in animals 168
  Berkeley on xxxv, lxxvii, xcv, 131–2, 194–5
  Descartes on 130, 133
  as distinct and separable 10, 13
  and external objects 113–16, 131, 194–6
  images from xcv, 113–15, 131–2
  impressions and ideas as forms of 13–15
  innateness of xxvii, 16, 114, 133; *see also* innate ideas
  Locke on xxxv, 16, 133, 194
  as part of moral philosophy 126
  scepticism regarding xxxv, xciv, xcix, 114–16, 157, 194
  vivacity in 13–15, 43–4, 131
  see also impressions; senses (sensory capacities)
Pericles 188
Périer, Marguerite 181

Périer, Gilberte 182, 296
persecutions 93, 100–1, 110
Pharsala 138, 183
Pharsalia 22, 95, 138, 183
phænomena:
  definition of 130
  and human nature 41, 44
  and natural philosophy 11, 27–8, 55, 76, 79, 97, 102, 104, 130, 142–3, 158, 162, 167–8
  observable 105–6, 130, 151, 170
  role in experimentation 11, 50, 102, 126, 142–3, 158
Philippi 95, 183
Philonous (in Berkeley) 153, 183, 196
philosophy, its two kinds 5 ff., 309
physic 122; *see also* physicians
physical points 117, 197
physicians:
  their knowledge from experience 37, 64, 67
  and miracle claims 94–5, 180–3
  and theories of animal spirits 153
physics 50, 130, 152, 157
piety 104, 183; *see also* impiety; religion
pious frauds 96, 184
Piso 147
Plato 43, 145, 147, 154, 187–8, 191, 273, 278–80
pleasure 6, 9, 12–13, 40–2, 64, 79, 88–9, 121; *see also* pain
Plessis-Praslin, Gilbert de Choiseul du Plessis-Praslin; *see* Choiseul, Gilbert de
Plutarch xxx, xxxii, 86, 92, 95, 137, 166–8, 172, 177, 183, 188, 278, 305
poets, poetry:
  among the polite letters 129
  effects of 5, 20, 104
  epic 20–2, 136–7
  and the passions or sentiments 20–2, 68
  and truth 13, 121, 190
  tragic 155
  and unity of action 18–22, 135–7
Poetics (Aristotle) 136, 154
Polemo 43, 147, 278
polite letters 7–8, 129
political interests of society 110
politicians:
  artifice of 110, 121
  skills and tasks of 8, 12, 64, 66, 131
politics 68, 101, 122, 129, 162, 172
Polybius 64, 161, 174, 278
Pompeian faction 95
Pompey 138, 183
pompous buildings 38
Pope, Alexander 126, 129, 137, 148
Popkin, Richard xxiv, 196, 297
Porphyry 144, 166, 168–9
Port-Royal xxxi, 95, 181, 278–9; *see also* Arnauld; Jansenists; Nicole; Pascal; Racine
power(s):
  of the gods 18, 58, 103–4, 141, 157–9, 199
  in human nature 10–11, 38–40, 53–4, 57, 121, 128, 199
  the idea of xxvii–ix, xcv, xcvii–ix, 50–2, 58–61, 143, 153
  impressions and causal xxix, xcix, 51–2, 54, 59, 61, 108
  and irregular events 67, 162
  Locke on causation and xxvii, xxix, 51, 58, 134, 141, 152–3, 194, 199
  Malebranche on causation and xxviii–ix, 58, 141, 143, 152, 309
  the meaning of the word 'power' 29, 50, 58, 60–1
  mechanical lxxviii–ix, 81, 169
  secret 11, 19, 26–33, 36, 44–5, 54–6, 66–7, 72, 81, 151
  of will and choice 52–8, 68, 72, 153–4, 163
  see also causation; energy; faculties of the mind

praise and blame 8, 75, 161, 164
pre-determined chain of causes 75
pre-established harmony 44, 147–8
prejudices lxxxviii, xcix, 9, 65, 81, 95, 101, 110, 112, 120, 160, 194; *see also* bias
prescience lxxvi, 77
pretence 33, 35, 68, 73, 98, 107
pretender; *see* Alexander the false prophet; impostors; pious frauds
pretending 58, 73
pretensions 12, 29, 35, 52, 89
prices (of Hume's books) xlvi–lvii
Price, Richard lxxxii–iii, xci–iii, 186
pride xxxv, 89, 120
Prideaux, Humphrey 176, 297
Priestley, Joseph xciii–iv, cii–iv
priests 95, 102, 104, 121
primary qualities 115–16, 152, 195–6
principles:
  of association xxvii, 17–19, 23, 42–4, 308
  of credulity and delusion 96
  custom as a principle of human nature xcvi, 37–8, 44, 47, 59, 145, 159, 308
  of human nature 5–12, 31, 36, 49, 64–9, 88
  mysterious 52–3, 77, 89–90
  natural powers and 26–9, 41, 55–6, 61, 74–5, 80
  of scepticism 112 ff.
  self-evident 112–13, 144
  of the understanding 8–9, 29, 33, 36–7, 69, 71, 79, 81, 99
probability:
  and animals 79–81, 113, 165–9, 307
  Butler's views on xxix, 139, 144, 150–1, 156, 170
  of causes 47, 150
  and chance 46–7, 135, 148–50
  dice and 46, 150
  judgements of proportion and 46–7, 70, 79, 84
  Locke on xxix, xxxii, 46, 143–4, 148–9, 151
  its nature 46–8, 84
  uncertainty and xxix, 85–6, 149, 151–2
  and uniformity of nature lxxxii, 31, 47, 87–8, 97–8, 108, 151
probable inference:
  and analogies 26–7, 57, 79–80, 86, 111
  and animals 79–81, 113, 165–9, 307
  and association; *see* association of ideas
  Butler's views on 139, 150–1, 156, 170
  and causation; *see* causation
  contrasted with reason and reasoning xxviii, 45–6
  from custom and experience lxxxiv, xcii, 31, 46–7, 87–8, 98, 108, 151
  and habit xxviii, 37, 55, 59–61, 80–1, 308
  and instinct and mechanism xcii, 45, 81, 119, 134, 168–9
  and miracles xxxii, 172–4, 185–6
  and uniformity of nature lxxxii, 31, 47, 87–8, 97–8, 108, 151
  see also causation; probability; reasoning
prodigies 55, 65, 83, 86, 88, 90–1, 93, 95, 98–9, 176
profane history lxxxvii, 83, 92
promises 25, 63
proof(s):
  and arguments from experience 31–2, 84, 87, 139
  of causal connections 53, 59, 61, 67
  of the existence of a deity 111
  of human liberty 71, 74
  of miracles 86–8, 94–9, 173, 182, 185

proof(s): (*cont.*)
nature of 46, 84, 149, 202
regarding simple ideas 16–17
propensities (mental) 35, 37, 80, 89–90, 95, 115
prophecies 89, 91, 99, 175, 183, 186
proportion:
of belief to evidence 84–6, 90, 150, 170
of cause to effect 47, 102–3, 109
probability judgements of 46–7, 70, 79, 84; *see also* probability
of sides 116
propriety 105–6
Protagoras 100, 186–7, 278
providence (divine):
and deism 156
denials of lxxviii, lxxxi, 100–2, 105–6, 190, 192
Epicurus's arguments regarding 101 ff., 187–90
and morality 101, 188, 190–1
and natural philosophy 189
particular 100, 106, 186–7, 309
and prophecy 183
Ptolemaic astronomy 119, 176
Pufendorf, Samuel 164, 168
punishment:
of animals 80
for blameable actions 74, 164
divine lxxxi, lxxxvii, 105–6, 108, 110, 186
purge 47, 151, 162
Pyrrho (Bayle on) xxxiv, 129, 157, 195–6, 198, 200
Pyrrhonian philosophy and scepticism:
its influence on Hume xxxiv–v, 121
nature and effects of xxxiv, 119–21, 193–4, 198–9
the subversion of 118, 120
see also scepticism
Pythagorean theories 165, 199

Quakers lxxvi
queen-regent (Anne of Austria) 95, 183, 272
Quintilian 127
Quintus Curtius Rufus 161

Racine, Jean 95, 181–3, 279, 305, 309
Racine, Louis 182
Rambler 135
Ramsay, Andrew Michael (the Chevalier) xxxiii, 149
Ramsay, Michael xiii, xxiv, lxxviii, 196
ratiocination lxxix–lxxx, 33, 116
rational faculties 25, 103; *see also* faculties of the mind; reason
rational religion xxxi, xxxiii
ravings of a madman 18, 135
Ray, John xxxiii, 189
Raynor, David v
real presence 83, 169–70, 309; *see also* Tillotson; transubstantiation
reason (faculty of):
animals as possessing 79–80
and apprehension of external objects 115–16
basis in instinct xcii, 45, 116, 119, 168–9
boundaries of taste and 22, 123
eloquence as obstacle to 61, 89, 91
and experience 37–8, 81, 83, 118, 122
as the faculty of intuition and demonstration 24
faith (religious) and 55, 77, 98–9, 102, 104, 110, 122, 185–6, 198–200, 307
faith in the powers of 45
function of contrasted to sentiment 101
its inability to discover cause and effect 25–8, 36, 44–5, 54–5, 122
limits and impotence of 25–9, 31, 37, 45, 54, 57, 60, 77, 119

rebellious 116–17
and relations of ideas 24, 27, 37, 109, 116–18
scepticism with regard to xvii, xxviii, xxxiv, xcvi, 10, 24, 59, 113, 116–18, 199
senses corrected by 113–14
and superstition 9
see also analogies; animals; experimentation; induction; taste; reasoning; understanding
reasoning:
a priori 25–8, 31, 54, 61, 85–6, 122, 199
abstract and metaphysical xxiii, 5–9, 12, 16, 22, 28, 36, 61, 116–18, 121–3, 128
analogical 26–7, 57, 79–80, 86, 111
anatomy of 25
in animals xxx, 166–9
certainty and probable 29, 37, 47, 71, 81, 144, 148–9
custom as a principle of xxviii, lxxix, 36–41, 44, 47, 59–61, 70, 80–1, 119, 308
deceitful 10, 112, 119
demonstrative xxvii–ix, lxxix–lxxx, 30–2, 117, 121–2, 139, 149
experimental xxiv, 32, 47–8, 68, 79, 81, 121, 123, 130, 308
fallacies in 45, 106, 108, 112
in formulating causal hypotheses 37, 79
habit and xxviii, 37, 55, 59–61, 80–1, 308
superstition thwarted by 10, 12, 83
syllogistical 122
uncertainty in 7, 9–10, 12, 39, 59, 77–8, 107, 112
see also analogy; animals; experimentation; induction; logic; taste; reason; understanding
rebellion of the angels 22
rebellious reason 116–17
rectitude 76
Recueil des miracles operés au tombeau de M. de Paris Diacre xxxii, 94, 179–81, 277, 297
reflection:
on common life 109, 121
maxims derived from 37–8
on the mind's operations 10, 49, 52, 70
Regnard, Jean-François 133
Reid, Thomas lxxvii, lxxxix, xciii–vi, xcix–ciii, 126
relations of ideas 24, 30, 138, 144, 199, 309; *see also* matters of fact
relics 43, 147, 182, 184, 219
religion:
Berkeley on subjects of 165, 173, 185, 189, 192–3
Butler on subjects of xxxii, 172–4, 185–6, 188–91
and Catholics, Roman; *see* Catholic religion
and Christian faith 98–9, 122, 185, 198–200, 307
Descartes on subjects of xxxiii, 58, 155–6, 158–9, 188, 193–4, 199
Egyptian 92, 176
enthusiasm in xiii, lxxxvii, 89, 94, 110, 130, 174, 178, 180, 191–2
free-thinkers and 182, 196; *see also* free-thinkers; irreligion
images in 42–3, 135, 147
Islamic 92, 176
Jewish xxxi, lxxxix, xciii, 94
miracles as the foundation of xxxi, lxxxvii, lxxxix, xci, 89–92, 96–9, 174, 182–6
and morality lxxxvii, cii, 35, 73–4, 188
natural xix, xxxi–iii, lxxvi, lxxxi, lxxxix, xcix, civ, 129, 186, 189
pagan lxxxix, 177

religion: (*cont.*)
paradoxes in lxxxviii, 91–2
and philosophy xciii, ci, 35–6, 102, 109–10, 112, 148, 188–90, 192
piety in 104, 183
religious hypotheses lxxxix, 103, 105–6, 109–10, 154, 190
revelation and revealed xxxi, xxxiii, lxxxix, xcix, ciii, 99, 122, 185, 188, 192, 199
scepticism about xvii–xix, xxxiii–iv, lxxxi, lxxxviii, xcix–ciii, 83, 91–2, 96, 98, 109, 112, 186, 192, 193, 199
superstition in 42–3, 130, 133, 146, 152, 174–5, 178, 192
threats to xvii, xxxiv, lxxv, lxxxvii, lxxxix, xcviii, c–i, 73, 98, 112, 164, 193, 199–200
religious philosophers 102, 112, 188–90, 192
Remarks on an Essay concerning Miracles (Ellys) lxxxvii–viii
'Remarks on the Laws of Motion' (Stewart) lxxviii–ix
resemblance:
effects of 42–3, 79, 111, 118
as a means of going beyond experience 79, 81, 88, 111, 114, 166
and the passions 42, 135
as a source of association xxvii, 17–18, 22–3, 32, 42–3, 63, 135, 309
as a source of error 16, 22, 32, 63
see also analogy; association of ideas; causation
resentment 16, 35, 77, 133
Retz, Jean François Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de 92–3, 177, 182, 279, 309
revelation (in religion) ciii, 99, 122, 185, 188, 192, 199
reverence 9, 104; *see also* piety; impiety; religion
Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals (Price) lxxxii–iii
rhetoric lxxxix, 61, 127, 136; *see also* eloquence; orators
rhetoricians 127, 274, 276
rhubarb (as purge) 47, 151, 162
roguery 93
Rohault, Jacques 140, 194, 197
Roman Catholics, Catholicism; *see* Catholic religion; mummeries; religion
Roman History (Dio Cassius Cocceianus) 100, 187, 275
Ross, Ian S. lxxvi, 298
Royal Society xiv, xxxii, xliii, lxxviii, 140, 171
Rutherforth, Thomas lxxxv–vi

sacerdotal character 100
sagacity 9, 58, 67, 79, 167; *see also* sage
sage 35, 91, 144–5
Saint-Médard cemetery 177–8, 180, 276, 278
saints 43, 147, 184; *see also* heroes
saviour, miracles of the 83, 94
scalene triangle 152
scepticism:
academic xxv, xxxiv–v, 35, 95, 112 ff., 120, 129, 145, 192–3, 198
antecedent and consequent 112–13
and Bayle xxiv, xxvii, 132, 154, 273
and belief xxxiv, lxxvii, cii, 116
and Berkeley xxviii, xxxiv–v, lxxvii, xciv–v, xcviii, 116, 140, 153, 183, 195–6, 307
about causation; *see* causation
charged against Hume xvii–xix, xxxiv, lxxvii, lxxx–iii, xcv–ciii
Cicero, on academic xxxiv, 145, 198
Descartes and Cartesian xxvii–viii, xxxiv–v, xciv–v, xcviii, 112, 193, 196
excessive and moderate xxxiv, xcv, xcvii, 198, 112–13, 116, 118–19,

120–1, 193, 198, 309
about external objects xxxiv–v, 10, 33, 113–16
about faculties of the mind 112–13, 121
mitigated xcv–viii, c, 112, 118–21, 198
and infinite divisibility xxxiv, 197
paradoxes of 100–1, 113, 118, 160
regarding primary and secondary qualities 115–16, 152, 195–6
its production of amazement 116–17, 119
Pyrrhonian xxv, xxxiv–v, 118–21, 132, 152, 193–4, 198–9
with regard to reason xvii, xxviii, xxxiv, xcvi, 10, 24, 59, 113, 116–17, 118, 199
about reason and faith 185–6, 200
regarding the reason of animals xxx, 166–9
about religion xvii–xix, xxxiii–iv, lxxxi, lxxxviii, xcix–ciii, 83 ff., 91–2, 96, 98, 100, 109, 112, 186, 192–3, 199–200
with regard to the senses xxxiv–v, lxxvi–vii, lxxx, xcvii, 113–16, 118, 152, 157, 194, 196, 309
scope of Hume's xvii–xix, xxxiv, 112
see also induction; religion
scholastic philosophy:
schoolmen xxviii, 16, 134, 187, 200
schools 71, 73, 118, 134, 204
science:
abstract 9, 39, 49–50, 116–17, 121, 128, 199
chimerical 5, 9–10, 152, 159
Copernican 119
demonstrative 138, 199
divisions of 121–2
experimental xxiv–vi, 42–3, 58–9, 64–5, 126, 130, 157
of human nature xxiv–vi, ciii, 1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 31, 37, 64–5, 79, 121–2, 126, 128–30, 167
limitations of 9–10, 71, 110, 121
mathematical xi, 24, 49, 118, 122, 129, 138, 199
moral 5, 37, 50, 116–17, 122, 126
Newtonian xvi, 142–3, 157, 277
physical xi, 37, 116–17, 122, 129, 142, 157, 197
Ptolemaic 119
and scepticism xcviii, 10, 113, 116–18, 121–2, 152, 197
Scipio Aemelianus Africanus Numantinus 43, 147, 276, 278–9
Scots Magazine xlvi, l
scruples 29, 59, 69, 96, 119–20
Search after Truth (Malebranche) 128–9, 131–2, 134, 138, 141–3, 145, 152–6, 159–60, 165, 167, 188, 193
Sebond, Raymond (Montaigne on) xxx, xxxiv, 142, 146, 166–8, 189, 194, 198, 200
secondary qualities 115–16, 195–6
secret causes, principles, and structures 11, 19, 26, 29–33, 36, 47, 53, 55, 66–7, 72, 151
sects of philosophy 100, 119, 187, 198
secular clergy 95
Selby-Bigge, L. A. 227
self-evident principles 112–13, 144
self-interest 89
self-love 16, 64
selfish heart 15
selfishness, system of 35, 145
Seneca, Lucius Annaeus xxx, 144–5, 165–6, 277
senses (sensory capacities):
and belief in external objects lxxvi–vii, lxxxiii, lxxxvii, 10, 14–15, 29, 38–9, 41–4, 50, 113–15, 117–18
faith in the lxxvi, 83, 113–15
and the imagination 13–14, 39–41, 80, 131

senses (sensory capacities): (*cont.*)
inference beyond the 15–16, 24–5, 29, 36, 38–9, 44, 50–2, 56–60, 63, 80
as inlets of information 13, 24, 38–9, 50, 63, 114
outward and inward xcvii, 13, 39, 152
reliability of the 113–15, 170, 194
scepticism with regard to the xxxiv–v, lxxvi–vii, lxxx, xcvii, 113–15, 194, 309
testimony of the lxxxiv, lxxxviii–ix, xcii, 24, 38, 60, 83, 85, 88, 91–2, 96, 98, 119
see also blue, missing shade of; perception(s)
sentiments:
annexed to belief xxviii, 13–14, 40–1, 46–7, 61, 139
approbation and blame as xxiii, 8, 11, 75, 77
and causation 50–4, 57–61, 64, 66, 68, 118, 159
and the mind 5, 13–15, 49–51, 54, 61, 77
of morals xxiii, xcvii–viii, 5, 8, 75, 77, 123, 127
outward and inward 14, 51, 53, 58, 127, 132
their role in philosophical inquiry xiv, xxiii, xcvii, 1, 5–8, 11, 19, 118
taste and 5, 7, 123, 127
uniformity of in human nature 64, 66
see approbation; belief; impressions; taste
Serapis 92, 176
Sextus Empiricus xxv, xxxiv, 132, 139, 152, 166, 186, 194, 198
Shaftesbury, third earl of (Anthony Ashley Cooper) xxiv, 128, 130, 199, 276
Shapiro, Barbara 148, 298
Sherlock, Thomas J. 171–2, 174, 176, 184
siege of Athens 22, 136–7
Silva (or Sylva), Jean-Baptiste 94, 181, 279
simplicity (Ockham's razor) 27, 141–2
sin 77, 164–5, 177
Skelton, Philip lxxxiv, 172
Smith, Adam xl, xliii, xlvii, 127
Socrates 100, 187, 279
solidity (sensible quality) 37, 51, 115, 152, 195
Somerville, James xciv, 126, 298
Somerville, Thomas xcviii, 298
sophistry xii, xcvii, civ, 63, 108, 121, 123
soporific 47, 151
Sorabji, Richard xxx, 168, 298
Sorbonne 273–4, 277
soul:
immortality of the 122, 165–6, 190–1, 308
nature of the 52, 54, 56, 165–9, 188
operations of the 39, 52, 71, 131, 135, 157
union with body 52, 56, 131, 153–4
see also future state; immortality; mind(s)
space and time 19, 103, 107, 109, 116, 120, 196–7; *see also* extension
Spectator xxiii, 127, 132, 138, 152, 192, 199, 272
Speusippus 43, 147, 279–80
Spinoza, Baruch:
atheism of xxxiii–iv, 192
influence of xxiv, 196
on miracles 173, 186
objections to the philosophy of xxix–xxx, xxxiii
spiritual substance xcvi, 52, 55, 153
St Clair, James xx
statuary 103, 204
statutes 100

Steele, Richard 129
Stewart, John xiv, xv, lxxviii–ix, xciii, 158
Stewart, M. A. v, xviii, xx, xxxii, xlv, 125, 227, 299
Stillingfleet, Bishop Edward 173, 185–7, 192
Stoics:
  on animals 166
  Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Seneca, and other 35, 144–5, 165, 175
  Hume's essay on 145
  on ills, goods, and providence 76, 186–8, 309
  their influence xxv, 119
  on the role of the self 145
Strahan, William xiv, xxxix, xl–vi, xciv, 125, 208, 210, 220
Strahan Ledgers xxxv–vii, liv–vi
sublime subjects, thoughts, and mysteries 14, 48, 76–7, 89, 96, 102, 105, 120–1, 199
substance:
  fiction of and ignorance of 52, 55, 153, 196
  and the imagination 114, 196
  material xcvi, 55, 153
  spiritual xcvi, 52, 55, 153
  and transubstantiation 169–70
Suetonius Tranquillus, Gaius 92, 146, 176, 279, 305, 309
superstition:
  and careless philosophy 9–10, 12, 35, 100–1, 182
  and miracles lxxxii, lxxxvii, 83, 92, 96
  popular 9–10, 101
  in religion 42–3, 130, 133, 146
  thwarted by just reasoning 10, 12, 83
  see also enthusiasm; zeal in religion and philosophy
Supreme Being 54, 56–7, 109, 115, 122, 156, 193–4; *see also* deity, deities; god(s)
surprise and wonder, passions of 88
Swift, Jonathan 183, 192
sycophants 101
syllogism 143, 203
syllogistical reasoning 122
Sylva; *see* Silva, Jean-Baptiste
sympathy 20–1, 23, 127, 205

Tacitus, Cornelius 64, 92, 125, 146, 161, 176–7, 279, 305, 309
talents 37–8, 103; *see also* virtue(s)
taste:
  as faculty of judgement and insight 7–8, 19, 22, 103, 123, 126–7, 129
  and sentiment 5, 7, 19, 123, 127
Tatler xxiii, 272
tautology 32
temerity xvi, 53, 59, 77
temptation 89, 95, 137
testimony:
  as a basis for belief xxxii, lxxx–xciv, ciii, 38, 60, 81, 83–9, 91–9, 119, 169, 171–2, 174
  of the senses lxxxiv, lxxxviii–ix, xcii, 24, 38, 60, 83, 85, 88, 91–2, 96, 98, 119; *see also* senses
  in support of miracles lxxx–ciii, 83–99, 171–4, 178, 180; *see also* miracles
Theodicy (Leibniz) 147, 276
theologians xxx, 134, 180, 185, 188
theology:
  and the argument from design xxxiii
  foundations and functions of 122, 188
  Hume's challenges to xcix, ci, 165, 169, 199–200
  and miracles xxxi, 83 ff.
  and scepticism 112–13, 122, 185, 199
  see also atheism; Catholic religion; miracles; religion; revelation (in religion)

Thibault, Marguerite 94, 178, 180–1, 279
Thomas Aquinas, St 169, 173, 191
Thucydides 137
Tiberius 38, 145–6, 280
Tillotson, John:
  on arguments and evidence 148–9, 169
  on divine providence and atheism 187–8, 192–3
  his influence on Hume xxiv, xxxii–iii
  on miracles 169–70, 173, 185
  on the real presence (transubstantiation) xxxii, 83, 169–70, 309
  works by 169, 280, 305
time; *see* space and time
Tindal, Matthew lxxv, 176, 192, 200
Todd, W. B. v, 300
Toland, John 153, 185, 200
Topsel, Edward 167
Tournay, Bishop of (Gilbert de Choiseul du Plessis-Praslin); *see* Choiseul, Gilbert de
tragedy 22, 136
tranquillity 100, 105, 144–5
transubstantiation xxxii, 83, 169–70; *see also* real presence; Tillotson
Trapp, Joseph 192
Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge (Berkeley) xxiv, xxvii, 116, 196, 273 (and numerous references in the Introduction and Annotations designated '*Principles*'); *see also* atheism; Berkeley; god(s)
A Treatise of Human Nature (Hume) v, xi–xvi, xix, xxxvi, xl, lxxvi, xcv–vi, civ, 1, 210, 230 (and numerous references in the Introduction and Annotations designated '*THN*')
truth(s):
  demonstrated by Euclidean geometry 24, 49
  and evidence 26, 73, 83, 85, 98, 113
  and falsehood 5–6, 10, 96, 113
  love of 35
  necessary 138
  and reality 20
  of reason 149
Tucker, Abraham 163
Tully; *see* Cicero
Turnbull, George 126, 134
Tweyman, Stanley lxxxiv–vii
Two Letters to David Hume, by One of the People called Quakers lxxvi
tyranny 38, 277, 280

Ulman, H. Lewis 93, 300
uncertainty:
  in abstract philosophy 7, 9–10, 12, 39, 59, 77–8, 107, 112
  in causes and effects 47, 50, 61, 66–7, 80, 84–5
  and probability xxix, 85–6, 149, 151–2
  from sceptical thought 112, 151
  see also certainty; causation; probability
understanding:
  limited powers of 7, 9–11, 24, 29–30, 33, 35–7, 39, 45–6, 60, 71, 80, 99, 107, 118
  as a mental faculty lxxxiii, 11, 49
  principles of the 5, 8–9, 29, 33, 36–7, 69, 71, 79, 81, 120
  its role in induction 29–30, 33, 36–7, 39, 45–6, 72–3
uniformity of nature:
  not demonstrable ciii, 26, 29–32
  not certified by past experience ciii, 26, 31–3
  and human actions 65, 67
  and inference 29–33, 81
  and miracles lxxxvi
  see also induction; reasoning

Unigenitus (Papal bull) 178–80, 278
unity of action 19–22, 135–7, 310
utility of the sciences 60

vanity 9, 35, 64, 89, 96, 191
velleïty 71, 163
velocity 28, 61, 159
vengeance, object of 74
Venus 8
veracity lxxxii, lxxxviii, 65, 68, 84, 92, 99, 112, 115, 193–4
verbal disputes 62–3, 71–2, 160, 163–4; *see also* definition(s) and meaning(s); words
Vespasian lxxxvii, 92, 176–7, 280, 310
vice:
  and the Deity 104–5, 110
  origin of 5, 8, 11
  philosophy and 5, 35, 77, 104
  and sentiment 8, 77, 105
  virtue and cii, 5, 8, 11, 49, 77, 105; *see also* virtue(s)
A View of the Principal Deistical Writers (Leland) lxxx–iii, 191
villany 85
Vintimille Du Luc, Charles-Gaspard de 180, 280
Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) xcvi, 136–7, 306
virtue(s):
  concept and impression of 14, 49
  and the Deity 103, 105, 110, 191
  in human nature and behaviour 5, 7, 65, 105
  and motives 5, 145, 191
  origin of 5, 8, 11, 133
  produces approbation 5, 129
  theories of xcix–c, 5, 8, 11, 35, 49, 77, 110, 129
  value of xcviii–ix, 5, 7, 65, 110, 145, 191
  vice and cii, 5, 8, 11, 49, 77, 105
  see also talents; vice
vis inertiæ 57–8, 142, 156–7, 310
vivacity (in perception) 13, 43–4, 131; *see also* impressions; belief
volition:
  and action 52–3, 55–8, 67, 163
  and the Deity 55–7, 75, 87, 156, 159, 165
  and liberty 75
  as a mental function 55–6, 58, 69, 163
  see also liberty and necessity; voluntary action; will
Voltaire (François Marie Arouet) 127, 136, 167, 280, 310
voluntary action 40, 53, 56, 64, 67–72, 75; *see also* liberty and necessity
votaries 91
the vulgar:
  inaccurate representations of 38, 54, 66, 96, 101
  nature of 161
  passions of 89–90, 174
  philosophers' opinions like 80
  principles exceeding 56, 66

Wallace, Robert 179
war 9, 22, 136–8
Warburton, William lxxv–vi, xci, 300
Ward, Seth 134
watermarks xlvii, li, liii, lv
Watts, Isaac 127, 163–4
Webster, John 128, 134
wheel and wheeling 69, 162
Whiston, William 183, 301
Whitehall Evening-Post xlvi, xlviii–li
Wilkes, John 190
Wilkins, John xxxiii, 134, 139, 148–50, 157, 170, 173, 188
will:
  human faculty of the xxx, 11, 40, 52–8, 70–74, 162–4; *see also* liberty and necessity; volition; voluntary action

will: (*cont.*)
of the Supreme Being 122, 152
Willis, Thomas xxx, 153, 167–8
Wishart, William xvii–xviii, 164, 188, 190, 193
witchcraft 94
witnesses to miracles lxxxi, lxxxiv, lxxxvii–viii, xc, xcii–iii, 83–6, 91–4, 171–4, 180
Wollaston, William 139, 144, 149–51, 171, 173, 184
Wolseley, Charles 173, 176, 187–8, 192
wonder; *see* surprise and wonder
Wood, Paul B. xciii, xcvi, 301
Woolston, Thomas 171, 173, 176, 184
Wootton, David xxxii
words:
associated with ideas 14–17, 61, 73
eighteenth-century 201 ff.
'essay', 'enquiry', and 'treatise' xxii
Hume's revisions of xl–ii, lxxix, 208 ff.
meaning of 40, 46, 50, 61–2, 73, 121
meaningless 58, 72, 133, 149, 164, 196
and verbal disputes 62–3, 71–3, 121, 160, 163–4
see also definition(s) and meaning(s); language; verbal disputes
worship 147, 176

Xenocrates 43, 147, 280
Xenophon 137, 187, 279

zeal in religion and philosophy xvi–xvii, xci, 1, 93–4, 101; *see also* enthusiasm
Zeno of Elea (Bayle on) xxiv, xxxiv, 196–7
Zeuxis 103, 190, 280